

# THE INTERNATIONAL $\blacktriangle$ SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. VIII

MARCH, 1908

No. 9

## In Memoriam — Karl Marx.

*Died March 14, 1883.*



MARCH — month of awakening spring. Nineteen hundred and eight — year of our presidential election, the greatest political battle of American Socialism against capitalism.

March 14, 1908, twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Karl Marx — what a glorious opportunity to pay homage to his memory! To prove to the world that he lives in his work; that, "being dead he yet speaketh" as never before, calling the workers to unite and break their chains!

The 14th of March will not pass by without some recognition on the part of American Socialists. There will be some memorial observance of this twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of the greatest of modern Socialists, "the Aristotle of the nineteenth century." There will be some observance of the day, but not, let us hope, a mournful observance. We need no solemn funeral dirges; no useless regrets that so much that he had planned was left unfinished.

We shall remember the day. We shall remember the life and deed of the most loveable of all the revolutionary host — most loveable and most learned. We shall rejoice that he was what he was; that he achieved what he did; that his achievements still endure to inspire the myriad slaves of earth.

"Most loveable and most learned" — "Most loveable of all the revolutionary host" — We know how learned he was: the world knows how great was his gigantic intellect, but how few of us know how *loveable* he was!

How little, alas! we know of the human Marx, of the lover and comrade he was! How little, after all, we know of the man! Of the philosopher, the political economist, the politician and revolutionist in the man we know, but we know little of his great human heart, so much bigger than even his mighty brain.

Liebknecht, with fine, sympathetic touch, has given us a picture of the man — a small canvas, impressionistic, painted in the dim light of life's evening, wonderfully true in spirit but occasionally inaccurate in details. Magnificent in its feeling, the drawing is sometimes faulty. Liebknecht's little book is a sketch — the sketch of a great master, it is true, but still only a sketch.

The young artist stands before some rough, unfinished sketch by a great master: he sees a glory in the rough lines and feels something of what the master must have felt. The desire is born in his soul to try his hand upon the subject — to paint what the master sketched but never finished. And so I have aimed these many years to picture Marx as he was. Not merely Marx the great thinker, but Marx the greater man: the jovial comrade, the profound lover.

Some day I shall do it, but today, on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death, there is no such picture. There are only sketches of details, meagre and fragmentary. Yet bare glimpses of the real Marx have their value — especially at this period of our history.

\* \* \*

It is known that Marx the radical philosopher became a Socialist through the "New Christianity" of Saint Simon. This has puzzled many, so great seems the chasm that yawns between the religious mysticism of Saint Simon and the materialism of Marx. May it not be, nay, does it not seem certain, that underneath his materialism there was a great ethical — or spiritual — urge? The man whose life was an example of splendid idealism, who read his Dante with devotion, so that he could almost repeat the whole of the great divine comedy from end to end — *Purgatorio, Paradiso and Inferno*, must surely have been of an intense spiritual nature!

And the great cosmic spirit of Whitman appealed to him from the first. When Harrison Riley, editor of "The International Herald," lately gone to his rest, introduced Whitman's writings to Marx he found a sympathetic listener. Marx returned again and again to the line

"Speaking of miracles, a hair on the back of my hand is as great a miracle as any"

and to the noble lines in "Pioneers" —

"All the past we leave behind;



We debouch upon a newer, mightier world, varied world;  
 Fresh and strong the world we seize, world of labor and  
 the march,  
 Pioneers! O, Pioneers!"

\* \* \*

Many bitter attacks upon religion on the part of Marx are familiar — not a few of them having been conveniently forged by the enemies of Socialism for their own purpose. But the Marx of middle life, the Marx of the International, was in fact one of the most gentle of critics, full of sympathy with the great underlying ethical principles of all religions, but an agnostic in his theology. "What are your reasons for believing?" he would ask, and no listener could be more patient, tolerant and gentle than he was. And his own position was always gently and frankly stated: "I do not know. I cannot understand it."

Descendant of a long line of Rabbis and son of remarkable parents, Marx came naturally by his spiritual instincts. His father, disciple of Voltaire, believed in God, he told his son, as Newton, Locke and Leibnitz had done. And his mother, when rallied upon her belief in God, replied that she believed in God, "not for God's sake, but for her own".

I like the gentle agnostic Marx; the patient, tolerant and earnest friend, listening with kindly spirit to the reasons his friends gave for their faith and saying for himself simply, "I do not know".

\* \* \*

A glimpse of the happier side of the domestic life of our great comrade: Liebknecht has sketched some of the saddest incidents of that life, the sombre pages glorified by the beautiful love of the husband and father. Living the life of proletarian poverty, their little sons died as the children of the poor die, victims of that poverty. And we see him standing by the grave of his little son, frantic with grief and ready to jump into the grave, his friends closing around him to prevent that happening. Or we see him standing by the grave of the wife he loved so well, the beautiful Jennie von Westphalen, not ready to jump into the grave in frenzied grief, but almost dropping into it, almost as dead as her whose last words had been of her beloved "Karl". His friends knew how great was his love for his wife, and Engels said prophetically when she died that Marx was likewise dead.

In all the pages of history it would be hard to find a more idyllic love-story than that of Marx and his wife. He literally worshipped her beauty and the memory of his children, long years afterwards, was of their tall, handsome father proudly and

lovingly parading up and down the little room where they lived with his tall, handsome wife and comrade, his arm around her waist!

To his children Marx was not less gentle and affectionate. What an adorable picture it is that Liebknecht gives us of the Marx family excursions to Hampstead Heath, with the profound philosopher boisterously enjoying donkey rides with the little ones! And what an adorable memory of the man his daughter, Madame Lafargue, holds! In a recent letter she writes me:

"Karl Marx was the kindest, the best of fathers; there was nothing of the disciplinarian in him, nothing authoritative in his manner. He had the rich and generous nature, the warm and sunny disposition that the young appreciate: he was vehement, but I have never known him to be morose or sullen, and steeped in work and worry as he might be, he was always full of pleasantry with us children, always ready to amuse and be amused by us. He was our comrade and playfellow".

\* \* \*

These little glimpses of the intimate life of our immortal comrade show us the man as he was: the great lover and tender parent. As we celebrate upon this anniversary his magnificent genius as a philosopher and political economist, let us not fail to remember also his magnificent humanity. Truly,

The elements

So mixed in him that Nature might stand up,  
And say to all the world, "This was a Man!"

JOHN SPARGO.



## Roosevelt's Place in History.



THE ROOSEVELT Administration is about ready for the final analysis. As a political factor it has made its final mark on history's page and closed the book. Many tried to speak the last word with reference to the President while he was in the midst of strife; while his policies and politics were undeveloped or developing. And hence their views were incomplete, subject to change and revision. Those who wrote of him in passion, either for or against, helped make history, but did not write it. The time has just arrived when the historian can calmly and fully review his career. If a historical writer does not now take full advantage of the opportunity, it is because he lacks the scientific method. There is no danger that the estimate now made in such manner will hereafter need much revision. For just as we deal with Grover Cleveland, though still alive, with all the accurate impartiality we might devote to some dead personage like Harrison or Mc Kinley; so can we treat Roosevelt both fairly and completely, now that he is not likely to add anything to his character by actions of import hereafter. He has withdrawn at last from all candidacy for the third term. His former withdrawals were all treated in the Pickwickian sense by his rivals; but to this last one they give full credit. And so, in faith, must we. For in reality the hard times killed whatever vitality his boom had.

The hard times that bowed Benj. Harrison out and ushered Grover Cleveland in, did not especially change the character of these men. The change of circumstances may have thrown some light on them among contemporaries, — opening the eyes of the blind, — as it were. A similar change in the times will not greatly affect the views of future historians on Theodore Roosevelt, though it modifies the expression of those who have already spoken. And while another question looms large at the close of his administration — our relations with Japan — yet as the Spanish war showed so well the temper of our subject, we are not in need of another crisis, no matter how great and critical it may be to confirm the well established fact, that, to speak in his own vein, he is a believer in "carrying a big stick." So we now enter into the dissection of his character and administration with all the confidence in the world in the timeliness of the matter and full faith in

the finality of the research, based, as any scientific study should be, on the relations of facts to each other.

\* \* \*

History will place Roosevelt as a shrewd politician, who recognized and used two methods by which to gain office, viz: — posing and advertising. He early learned the value of both. He posed as a reformer when he first entered the arena as an assemblyman in the legislature of New York. But he took his breakfasts with Platt! He daily associated with the great Boss. His succeeding moves in donning picturesque clothes were successful attempts to continue this posing before the people. He sought the spot light, and he always gained the center of the stage; as cowboy, hunter, warrior, peace-maker or preacher. He proved a master hand at the theatrical business. He combined in himself the requisites of press agent and star.

Dunn, the official photographer of the National Committee, tells how particular he was as to dress on the rounds of his campaigns. At one town, he appeared in a silk hat, at another in a slouch; at one stop, he wore baggy trousers, at the next one he put on pants that were carefully creased and pressed; he did it all on careful telegraphic information giving the important news as to how the next reception committee would appear. And he was careful to have the pictures printed as large as possible in the local press.

His executive policy showed a similar tendency of conciliation of those who managed the machine, and barn storming for himself. He was first a free trader, then a protectionist. He was the man of peace and then of war. He was against the Croton ring and then for it! He denounced the trusts, then accepted their campaign contributions. He never tarried long at one spot, but kept moving on from place to place, principle to principle, thus razzle-dazzling the public; dancing from position to position and posing as a mighty force in each new place; but always shaping his sails to whatever wind might blow.

His first national prominence dated from the time he was Police Commissioner in New York City. Here he showed his genius for the use of publicity to promote his own fortunes. He rewarded acts of bravery of the humble policemen, not so much because of the act of the servant as for the opportunity of advertising the master.

Next he set the wheels in motion and landed, through the efforts of relative and friends, (some of whom he afterwards repudiated), in the War Office as Assistant Secretary. Immediately he began to prepare for the conflict. He put a few brass nails upon his big stick.



They tell a story of Hearst, that he ordered his reporters to furnish the news, — "I shall furnish the war." The story is denied but it well illustrates the character of one who loves the head of the procession. While Hearst was encouraging war, through his press, Roosevelt was preparing for it in the navy yards. Hearst was a typical Jingo at this time, Roosevelt a grim Machiavelli. After the country had been worked up to the proper pitch, war became inevitable. McKinley reluctantly declared it. Roosevelt soon resigned from the navy and went out onto the fields of Texas to head a mob of picturesque cowboys. He donned a new and strange uniform. Then he had his picture taken; — this time appearing as the Man on Horseback. During the war he ran the press bureau effectively. He managed to keep in the public eye. He was proclaimed the hero of San Juan and of the battle of the Decayed Beef Can.

After tiring of the army he resumed his regular occupation of politics and ran for governor of New York. The value of advertising made itself felt and he was elected. Then he stepped in the way of the bosses and they got rid of him by his removal to the humble seat of Vice-President. Then a half crazed assassin came along and put Roosevelt where he wanted to be sooner than he had expected.

He was praised for the tact he showed under those circumstances. Hearst was greatly blamed for his want of it. The country turned towards the man of tact and against the man of gall. Also it appeared that a newspaper hero is more popular than a newspaper devil.

The political genius of Roosevelt now showed itself in full play. The power to plan and perfect an organization and to build a machine was quickly shown and felt. He soon dominated his party and through it, the country. He succeeded in getting a re-nomination and an election.

Now he became President of the United States of America by virtue of his own right. He was at last in position to develop a policy. He was in office for four years and perhaps for eight. Up to this time he had shown himself ready enough to dominate any minor set of circumstances. Now he failed under the crucial test. He had no policy to offer.

Then a voice whispered into his ear, that as two terms had come easy, he better try and make it three. So he began secretly to plot for the third term.

I take it that any President has the ambition to be great enough for this big country of America. Roosevelt wanted to be the man of one party. And he became so for quite a while. He tried to show that the political genius of the Americans was superior to their business genius. And it looked at first

as though he would be able to prove that too. But he soon faltered; he wavered and turned back and then finally fled in utter rout. He saw himself forced to the feet of big business. He had to turn to the trusts for his policy and his helpers. And when the trusts broke down, when the panic and the slump came, he was left friendless. From being regarded as a God, he was quickly discovered to be made of common clay. From being an object of secret terror to the muck-rakers, he now became their convenient target.

\* \* \*

What had angered the machine politicians and some of the men of big business was, that they realized Roosevelt had no genuine love for them. And so, while they did not manufacture the panic to down him, as certain narrow sighted ones claim, yet they did take advantage of the opportunity to blame him for it, and thus they wiped out his third term aspirations.

It is a well known rule of politics that when a president is held responsible for hard times, he might as well retire then and there; it'll do him no good to hang on. After every panic of importance, there has been a change of party except in '76; and then there was a change, only it wasn't allowed to count.

\* \* \*

This leads to the question, what is the definition of "statesman?" A statesman is one who lives for the state; uses all his energies to make it greater and more powerful; makes it a place where it is more blessed in which to live; one who has the policy of making the whole people greater than any part of them. Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln fit this definition. They are the great American statesmen so far. And Roosevelt might have risen to their heights, had he kept his will fixed on this ambition alone.

\* \* \*

To make the point entirely clear, we will put it this way:

The tendency of late times, is towards consolidation of business, forming trusts, etc. This is the economic law and is in the line of evolution. It can't be stopped but it might be used. Roosevelt's policy should have been to see that the government's business progressed just as rapidly as the business of the trusts did. He should have paid more attention to Uncle Sam's large concerns — the post-office, the canals, the forest and mineral reservations, the extension of postal banks, of parcel-post delivery. He might have felt the necessity to take over the mail trains into government ownership;



to seize the telegraphs and the telephones, as they have done abroad; to hold the wireless message for the states' own and thus met the wily captains of industry on their own grounds. He might have taken possession of the coal fields, when the whole country was begging for such action.

He might have shown himself a great administrative executive and thus held back the arrogance of capital, the rising tides of discontent.

But he did not rise to the occasion. He chose to be a newspaper hero and so pass on, rather than be the man of iron and remain. Had he dealt openly, fairly and honestly with capital, he would have accomplished much of note and worth. Had he dealt openly, fairly and honestly with labor, he might have risen to the glory of Lincoln.

But scheming for the third term, never rising above his own personal fortunes, and having no administrative policy, he now sees his plans all knocked awry, and is forced into an involuntary withdrawal from public life. He must pass away the remaining years of his life in vain regrets over what might have been; not having the satisfaction that Napoleon had of knowing that, while he held the powers of the State in his hands, he had made full use of them. That he had been the leader of his class and his retirement would not witness the return of the other class to power again.

The next great Statesman in America will be he, who sees that the new movement is the struggle of the proletariat for the powers of the State. It will be he who will head that movement, he who will lead it on to victory. He will be the next Lincoln.

\* \* \*

Since writing the foregoing, the famous message of Jan. 31st, relating to labor and capital has been given to the public and I have been asked to incorporate in this article my views on the same. The first temptation was simply to regard this as a resumption of his former mood and that it signalized the return of Lost Nerve. However, it hardly can be fairly characterized in that way, but is perhaps, the first public acknowledgment of Theodore Roosevelt, that his policies are on the defensive.

The plutocracy know that it is of no use to put up anyone for president of the United States, except one who is personally acceptable to the people as a clean and honest gentleman. Such a man was William McKinley, who was fortunate in having a business administrator as his confidential friend and adviser in the person of Mark Hanna. McKinley was an idealist; Hanna was a materialist, and the two together were able to pull the load a likely distance. Roosevelt thought that he could haul the

wagon well enough singly and alone and while apparently he was making some speed, yet because a line was hitched to the post, he only traveled around a circle.

Purely idealistic men, preaching bourgeois dualism, are bound sooner or later to come to disaster, while practical men of administrative ability, even of somewhat low and debauched ideals, will accomplish more in the administrative line. Take for instance, the heelers of Tammany Hall and the results of their actions. These are more considerable, by reason of their being able to do business, and cope with business, than the acts of idealists on the order of Mayor Jones and Mayor Dunne and others who are so theoretical that they become tangled in the maze of their own spinning, and who leave practically nothing to show for their tenure of office.

Roosevelt started out with the handicap of Sunday School ideology. He thought if he endeavored to give a fair and square administration on a high plane, characterized by personal integrity on his own part with a fitting strenuousness, he could accomplish much of worth. But when this plan was put to the test, by the panic, he had nothing to offer, and became panic-stricken himself during the worst of the storm.

In the meantime, certain criticisms were cunningly devised by those whom he considered his enemies, and by some whom he had formerly regarded as friends, to the effect that he had become of unsound mind over his own personality, and they substantiated their arguments by quoting the intemperance of his violent characterization of those with whom he disagreed. The experts have made a rather good *prima facie* case, that he has gone mad over his own ego. They point out he both distrusts his enemies and entrusts his friends to the point of insanity.

This view of him reminds me of the picture Cervantes painted of the historic Don Quixote. In fact, the more we regard the confused philosophy of our subject, the more does a certain analogy lie between him and the Spanish cavalier of celebrated history. The windmill seems to inevitably characterize both careers and just as the eminent knight errant continually engaged in foolish tilts with clothes lines and other fantastic shapes of his imagination, so has our tempestuous subject been on a knight errantry after certain foolish infatuations and without the restraining hand of a Sancho Panza.

There are two classes of competent people: those whose philosophic conclusions are based on the solid ground of fact; the materialists who know what they want and go after it and get it. These are the captains of industry and the plutocrats of the upper classes. The other class of competents are those who are not only materialistic in regard to the getting of the good things of life for themselves, but who have determined that those things



should go all the way around. They have a universality of benefit in their theorizing.

The confused sentimentalists, whether republicans, democrats, or prohibitionists, lie between these two, and that explains the "insanity" of Roosevelt.

It is no wonder that he is forced to spend the remaining months of his official life in strenuously defending what he calls, "my policies" which in reality are nothing more than ephemeral fancies of a mind confused by the abstractions of the four year's world and that he has practically given up the fight to put the world forward any more. He clearly sees that he is not now and never has been a serious factor in progress, and is trying to explain why.

The explanation he will never make, no more than Don Quixote could explain the failure of his fruitless mission to restore chivalry to a world become purely commercial.

Socialism is the key that will unlock the enigmas of the present. No other key fits the lock.

ROBIN E. DUNBAR.

## Karl Marx on Sectarianism and Dogmatism.

(Extract from a letter written by Marx in London, November 23, 1871, and addressed to his Friend Bolte, a member of the Central Committee of the "International" in the United States.)



THE INTERNATIONAL was organized for the purpose of putting the actual fighting organizations of the working class in the place of the socialist and semisocialist sects. The original statutes and the inaugural address show this at the first glance. On the other hand, the internationalists could not have maintained themselves, had it not been for the fact that the historical development had already smashed the sectarian cliques. The evolution of socialist sectarianism and that of the real labor movement always move in opposite direction. So long as the sects are historically justified, the working class is still unfit for an independent historical movement. As soon as it reaches this point of maturity, all sects are essentially reactionary. However, the International repeats in its history what history in general shows everywhere. The obsolete seeks to rehabilitate itself and maintain itself within the newly established form.\*

And the history of the International was a continual struggle of its General Council against the attempts of sects and amateurs, who tried to maintain themselves against the real labor movement within the International. This struggle was carried on at its congress, but still more in the private negotiations of the General Council with the individual sections.

Since in Paris the Proudhonists (Mutualists) had helped to found the Association, they naturally were at the helm in Paris during the first years. In opposition to them collectivist, positivist, and other groups naturally arose later.

In Germany there was the Lassalle clique. I have myself carried on a correspondence with the illfamed Schweitzer for two years and irrefutably demonstrated to him, that Lassalle's organization is a mere sectarian organization and as such opposed to the organization of the real labor movement desired by the International. He had his reasons for not understanding.

At the close of 1868 the Russian Bakounin entered the International, with himself as its chief, under the name of "*Alliance*

---

\* This is shown once more by the recent attempt of the Socialist Labor Party to gain admission to the Socialist Party.—E. U.



*de la Democratie Socialiste.*" Although he was a man without any theoretical training, he pretended to represent in this separate body the scientific propaganda of the International and to make this the special avocation of this second International within the International.

His program was a superficial mixture of things grabbed up right and left, such as the equality of classes, the abolition of the right of inheritance as a point of departure of the social movement (Saint-Simonian nonsense), atheism dictated to its members as a dogma, etc., and his main dogma was Proudhonian, namely, abstention from political activity.

This primer for children found some support (and still has a certain hold) in Italy and Spain, where the conditions for a real labor movement have but little developed, and among a few conceited, ambitious, shallow doctrinaires in Romanic Switzerland and Belgium.

This doctrine (a hash borrowed from Proudhon, Saint Simon and others) was and is of secondary importance to Bakounin, and primarily a means for his own personal aggrandizement. Theoretically a zero, he is in his element as an intriguer.

For years the General Council had to battle against this conspiracy (which was supported to a certain degree by the French Proudhonists, particularly in Southern France). At last it struck the long prepared blow by the resolutions 1, 2 and 3, IX and XVI and XVII at its London conference.\*

It is a matter of course that the General Council will not lend its support to the same thing in America which it opposes in Europe. The resolutions 1, 2 and 3, and IX, offer to the New York Committee the legal weapons, by which they may make an end to all sectarianism and amateur groups and eventually expel them.

The political movement of the working class has for its natural and ultimate aim the conquest of the political power for it, and this requires, of course, that a previous organization of the working class, arising out of its economic struggles, should have reached a certain degree of maturity.

On the other hand, every movement, in which the working class meets the ruling classes as a class, and seeks to overcome them by pressure from without, is a political movement. For instance, the attempt to force from individual capitalists a re-

---

\* Resolution 1, 2 and 3 forbid all names of sects and decide that the individual sections shall be known exclusively as sections of the International in the various localities; resolution IX declares that the political activity of the working class is necessary and that this political activity is inseparable from its economic movement; resolution XVI declares the question of the "*Alliance de la Democratie Socialiste*" settled by the announcement of its dissolution on the part of its secretary; resolution XVII permits to the Jurassic sections in Switzerland to adopt the name "*Federation Juraesienne*", but censures its publications "*Progrès*" and "*Solidarité*".

duction of the labor time, in some individual factory or in some line of occupation, is a purely economic movement; but a movement trying to obtain an eight-hour law, or something similar, is a political movement. And in this way a political movement grows everywhere out of the various economic movements of the working class, that is, a movement of the class to enforce its demands in some general form, in some form, which shall have a general social power.

Wherever the working class is not far enough advanced in its organization to undertake an effective campaign against the collective power, that is, the political power of the ruling classes, it should be trained for this work by a continual agitation against the attitude towards the policies of the ruling classes which is hostile to us. Otherwise the working class will remain a plaything in the hands of the ruling classes. This has been demonstrated by the September revolution in France and is proved to a certain degree by the game, which is still played with success in England by Gladstone and his helpers.

KARL MARX.

*(Translated by Ernest Untermann.)*



## A Tallow Candle.



WHAT'S THIS—what's this—more light wanted? Well, as Br'er Mc Pherson is the first Socialist I ever saw or heard of who didn't think he knew it all and who hadn't information to give away, throw away and burn, somebody ought to send a few scintillating sparks in his direction. But perhaps the situation is not so desperate as he seems to regard it; perhaps—as light is known

to travel 182,000 miles in a second—the irradiation from a tallow candle will do the trick.

But right here at the outset it is pertinent to inquire: What is there in the philosophy of the under-dog, in the co-operative, as distinguished from the competitive, principle that gives a Socialist the chance to aim at its vital concepts harpoons of logic that would make a Mallock go off and kick himself for envy? Can it be that our terminology is to blame? Shall it finally come to this—that a Socialist essay will resemble a New-thought-brain-splurge?

"Ay; there's the villainy!" exclaimed Petruchio to the tailor, when he came to the sleeves; and it may be that our wealth of metaphor, our redundant rhetoric, the "scientific" atmosphere created by "intellectuals" and college professors, have in some degree tended to obscure the main issue which is: The planet for those who perform the work of the planet. Or, putting it another way—Happiness and abundance being the only desiderata, these cannot be assured to *any* until they shall have become the heritage of *all* through universal co-operation.

A recognition and adoption of the principle must include, in the first place, the ascendancy (by pacific or more forcible means, according to circumstances) of the working class; in the second place, the abolition of classes.

We read and hear nowadays a great deal about economic determinism and the materialistic conception of history. Admirable phrases both; but we should have a standard by which to definitely interpret their precise meaning. Some writers use them interchangeably, while others assume that the materialistic conception of history is simply the antithesis of the theological conception of history; leaving to economic determinism the explanation of purely economic phenomena, that is, the bread and butter side of the question.

Nature, evolution, psychology, metaphysics—are all words

for the unwary to conjure with; for they seem to have whatever meaning the individual writer wishes to juggle into them. In this regard it is perhaps unfortunate that Engels should have written a sentence like this: "Man, at last the master of his own form of social organization, becomes at the same time the lord over Nature, his own master—free"; for it afforded McPherson an opportunity to read into the word "Nature" a meaning never dreamed of by Engels or probably, for that matter, any other Socialist, and gave him a chance to perpetrate that masterpiece of illogical logic entitled "Economic Determinism and Martyrdom."

Nature is the physical universe, the cosmos, composed, according to scientists, of matter and force; and how, in the name of all that is sensible, can man lord it over that combination? Man is the infinitesimally puny creature of Nature, and in the twinkling of an eye she may snuff out the whole race and reconvert into nebulous star-dust the cockle-shell upon which, like any ruffed-up bantam cock, man "struts and frets his little hour." But as man cannot lord it over Nature, neither does she consciously lord it over man, for that would imply a *preconceived plan* by which the race was being lifted to some glorious height or, on the other hand, rushed to some fearful doom (according as she was benevolently or malevolently disposed) and in either case, being the creatures of a superior will, all our efforts to change the existing order of things would necessarily be as ineffective as they would be ill-advised.

From which it comes about that all this talk about man lording it over Nature and Nature lording it over man is the silliest moonshine. And yet upon this prestidigitation of sovereignty, by which the control passes from Nature to man, is based McPherson's entire argument. When man diverts the raging torrent of the Mississippi into artificial storage reservoirs, to be later drawn upon in times of drouth; when he constructs dykes, retaining walls and levees along that or any stream; when he utilizes natural waterfalls to furnish heat, light and power—he in a sense harnesses Nature and forces her to become his slave. But that cannot be the sort of sovereignty to which McPherson refers, for it is not contingent upon the inauguration of the Socialistic programme—from the earliest times man has thus taken advantage of Nature.

What, then, did so clear a thinker, so logical a writer, as Engels mean when he prophesied man's ascendancy over the forces of Nature? Why, just what every student and every Socialist has always supposed him to mean. As a figure of rhetoric, as an allegory—as when one speaks of owning the earth—all writers indulge in such flights of fancy, and Engels was no exception. Out of his rich imagery, when dreaming of the day



that man should throw off his industrial shackles, and what was of infinitely more importance, his mental shackles, Engels allows himself that harmless metaphor.

"It seems to me," declares McPherson, "that neither he (Engels) nor Marx ever proved how man could become free, in the sense in which he uses the word. Since he and Marx admit that man has come up from savagery by the road of pain—by being slaves to Nature, how, then, can he consistently assert that by a transition more or less cataclysmic or revolutionary, man suddenly awakens to the fact that he is no more the slave of Nature, but Nature is thenceforth his slave? As he puts it, 'man emerges from mere animal conditions to human ones.'"

It is very true that neither Marx nor Engels ever did prove how man could become free, in the sense in which he (meaning McPherson) uses the word; but that is only an incomplete statement of their position. To add the finishing stroke one is compelled to say they never tried to. And while we're all ready to admit that man has come up from savagery by the road of pain (the pain is not all out of the road even yet) we must strenuously balk at the idea that he came up by being a slave to Nature; nor will Nature presently or more remotely become his slave—in *any* sense, excepting a figurative one. Nor in Engels' matter-of-fact and (to me) entirely reasonable statement that man emerges from mere animal conditions to human ones (that is, as soon as he has had the good taste to throw monopoly off his back) can I discover good cause for believing that he expected Nature to thenceforth allow herself to be saddled and bridled in man's service—in any different sense than she so allowed herself before the said emergence.

Yes, yes, Br'er Mac, this is a "weary world" and the "pale nemesis" still pursues us, her golden hair a-hangin' down her back. From ancient Babylon to San Juan Hill (there was at least one Spaniard shot in the back during the latter and now historic engagement) the record is black with human hatred and red with human blood. Whether it be primitive barbarism, early slavery, feudal serfdom or the more up-to-date capitalistic maelstrom that we put under the limelight we see nothing but blood and tears and sweat and misery and victims by the million—by the billion—but don't, for heaven's sake, charge that up to Marx or Engels or economic determinism or Nature or progress or evolution; for they're each and all, seriatim or bunched, absolutely guiltless. If you believe in a God and think his shoulders are broad enough to stand it—put it onto him. If you do not believe in a God—lay it to Harry Orchard—or to heredity—or both.

"In all earnestness" inquires McPherson, "is there not something radically preposterous in this continual enslavement of one generation for the betterment of the next? We seem, even at

our so-called high scientific and intellectual stage, to be still no better than the blind and brutal savages, our ancestors. Yet, so far as we know, or so far as Marx or any of his disciples has told us, there is no alternative."

Indeed, there is something radically preposterous in the continual enslavement of one generation for the betterment of the next; but when we are gravely assured that neither Marx nor any of his disciples has proposed an alternative it is perfectly in order to protest and we rise to insert a correction.

In the grandest and most pregnant words ever uttered by mortal tongue—words that will reverberate down the ages when lesser perorations shall have been buried a mile deep under the rubbish-heaps of history—Karl Marx, his lone and stalwart form silhouetted against a background of almost universal sycophancy, thundered forth: *Workers of the world unite! You have everything to gain; you have nothing to lose but your chains.*

That was his alternative to an endless-chain of human sacrifice, and some at least of his disciples and followers are still thrilling with that vibrant message the dull, quiescent and unimaginative slaves to ignorance, to convention, to heredity, to superstition.

Let us pass on to the *crème de la crème* of McPherson's argument, the grand climax of his ratiocinative method, by which are reduced to nihilistic kindling-wood not only martyrdom and progress, but the essence—the quintessence, one may say—of Socialism itself. He says:

"Reasoning from Marx' and Engels' doctrine, and using the criteria and ideas provided by my capitalistic surroundings (as we all perforce must do) I should be compelled to predict that if the future releases man from the necessity of blood-spilling—from the well-known method of making martyrs, he must inevitably become extinct. Furthermore, I should be compelled to say, that since capital began its own negation, and since this negation is the germ of a higher development, and that higher development will be Socialism, and since Socialism implies reversal of the time-honored relations between man and Nature (as Engels says) Socialism will contain no negation; therefore, containing no negation, it will contain no germ of a higher development. Consequently we are forced to admit that Socialism cannot be progressive. In other words Socialism precipitates a social organism in which no martyrs are manufactured by economic determinism. And as martyrdom, since the dawn of life on the globe has been borne in the same womb with progress—is, in fact, its twin brother; therefore Socialism cuts off the possibility of martyrdom, and, at the same time, cuts out the womb which, it is held by Marx, gives conception to progress. And to assume

that Socialism would not need to move, evolutionarily speaking, would be the wildest utopianism."

Reasoning from any old doctrine, and using the criteria and ideas provided by *my* capitalist surroundings (as we all perforce must do, though we don't all do it the same way) *I* should be compelled to predict that if the future releases man from the necessity of blood-spilling he must inevitably increase and multiply as never in the world before; but as this is simply a difference of opinion, and as prophets have to get out of their own countries, anyway, before they can find anybody to believe 'em, we may as well dismiss prophecy.

Now we plunge into deep water . . . . Everybody will please put on a life preserver . . . . Capital begets its own negation; this negation is the germ of a higher development (which is Socialism) but since Socialism (according to Engels) implies a reversal of former relations between man and Nature, therefore it is to contain no negation and no germ of a higher development; consequently (according to Marx) it cannot be progressive because it ceases to manufacture martyrs through the workings of economic determinism; but a non-progressive Socialism would be utopianism—no; wildest utopianism.

And this, we are told, is Marxian and Engelsian doctrine!!!

Personally, I am of the opinion that such a state of affairs would contain, or at least beget, its own negation, just as did capital in the first place, and that the interrupted pastime of martyr-making would forthwith be renewed; which, again, would lead to a society so perfect that it would abhor the very thought of martyrdom and would put an end to it; which, in turn—but this is traveling in a circle . . . something is wrong . . . ah! I have it—the womb which gives conception to both perfection and martyrdom has been cut out! Which vastly simplifies things.

And yet—and yet—although Engels has reversed the time-honored relations heretofore existing between man and Nature and Marx has destroyed the womb that labored with those ill-assorted twins, Progress and Martyrdom, the Promised Land is not yet for us; for we are still wild Utopians. Whither shall we turn? Where look for relief? . . . . Aha,"—that "pale nemesis"!—who has made provision for *her* exorcism or destruction? Nobody, so far as I can learn. Marx has not, nor Engels; nor has McPherson. Why? oh! why has she been left at large? . . . . Darkness supervenes . . . . the race is lost.

\* \* \*

Just a word in conclusion. Mr. McPherson may interpret Marx and Engels as he can or as he must, "as we all perforce must do;" but in those two grand old warhorses of the "Mani-



festos" I see a pair of grizzled veterans whose life-work, given to a thankless, profitless and hopeless task, was not to free man from the domination of Nature, but to free him from the domination of his own rapacious kind—from Special Privilege whose specialty was plunder, from Divine Righters whose divinity was manifested in a heretofore fairly successful effort to befog the mind. They were revolutionists first, last and all the time, and evolutionists incidentally. But revolutions—that is, successful ones—require revolutionaries; and as the opportunity was denied them to use their swords in a class-conscious, intelligent proletarian revolt, for the good and sufficient reason that there was a dearth of class-conscious and intelligent proletarians who desired a revolt, they used their pens, instead, with what effect they might. They perfected and taught a surplus-value theory, as applied to wages, so that the victims might understand how they were being robbed; they gave a fresh fillip to the proletarian movement by demonstrating that society was divided into classes, the exploiters and the exploited, thus playing upon the strongest of human motives—self-interest—and so inciting to class-consciousness; they further encouraged the proletarian mind by attempting to prove that the capitalistic structure, because its foundations were insecure, would finally topple of its own weight; in the materialistic—(as distinguished from the theological-) conception—of history philosophy, they endeavored to arouse that irreverence for priestcraft and convention which is so fundamentally essential if the workers are ever to "emerge from mere animal conditions;" and on the other hand they applied the same philosophy to interpret the economic trend of history (the new-fangled name is economic determinism); they taught the masses that they must rely upon themselves, fight their own battles, eschew all compromise (even with Nature, to the best of my knowledge and belief) and that terrestrial salvation, if terrestrial salvation was at all to be theirs, *had to come from within their own class-conscious and militant proletarian organization.*

These things I know they taught, for I can give chapter and verse to prove it.

Maybe they also taught that by some miraculous sleight-of-hand man and Nature are to change places—are to reverse their "time-honored" relations—and that martyrdom is the sine qua non of human happiness and progress, and that Socialism, by ripping out the womb which gives conception to both martyrdom and progress, leads us straight to the wildest utopianism; but I cannot believe it. It sounds to me like a tale with which to beguile the marines.

C. A. STEERE.

*Chipachet, R. I., Jan, 27. '08.*

## Brains.



SOME ENTERTAINMENT and perhaps much profit may be derived from consideration of a peculiar phase of recent thought and discussion in the Socialist movement in America. I refer to the more or less heated attacks upon those of our comrades who are included in the classification, "intellectuals". The subject also involves consideration of the cognate idea of "leaders" and "leadership". Strangely enough it is the "intellectuals" who are attacking the "intellectuals" and the "leaders" who are delivering the mightiest blows at "leadership". As no one has appeared to take up the cudgels for the sorely beset men of education in the movement may I not fly to the rescue? I may urge in proof of my disinterestedness that while a fond and self-sacrificing father gave me the doubtful advantage of a college education I learned a trade of my own volition and by virtue of union membership am, perhaps, as truly a proletarian as any comrade who wields pick or shovel.

If modesty is a virtue we must score one point at the outset for the despised "intellectual". History does not record examples of more passionate humility than have recently been provided by "intellectuals" in the movement who have sent out clarion calls for the pure and undefiled proletarians to take control of their party and do their own thinking. Because such appeals have gone up does not prove by any means that any one has taken from the proletarian control of the party or the operation of individual brains but merely serves to illustrate a tendency of the time which seems worthy of analysis.

We have hooted from the stage of the world's thought the idea that there is any divinity that doth hedge about a king but not a few of our Socialist "intellectuals" have apparently merely swapped idols and are disposed to outdo the old party demagogues in canting appeals to the "horny handed sons of toil". There is majesty and singular potency in the historic slogan. "Workers of the world unite; you have a world to gain and nothing to lose but your chains," but as far as I have been able to determine, the author of that slogan was of just as much value to the Socialist movement as he would have been if education had not fitted him for the conception and execution of the project of writing "Capital". Marx distinctly sets forth that the man who works with his brain performs useful labor and if we are going to demand that proletarians alone be admitted to the sacred re-

sponsibilities of party membership why, in the name of truth, may we not consider the vertical lines between the eyes of the student as great a mark of honor, and as sure a sign of worthy labor done, as the callous on the hand of the man with a hoe?

An astonishing but still characteristic argument was recently leveled at the men of his own kind by an accomplished "intellectual". In a spasm of adoration of the "horny-handed" he assured the factory workers that the manual laborer who knows nothing is better qualified as a soldier of the revolution than the college professor who knows much because, forsooth, the professor is more than likely to be wrong about many things. In other words, barbarism is better than civilization because civilization is marred by many disagreeably rotten spots. Of course that proposition cannot be seriously argued but it appears to be necessary to state what should be obvious; namely, that other things being equal, and the fallibility of the human intellect being admitted, the ignorant man, no matter what his class, is sure to be wrong about more things than the educated man.

If there is anything at all in education; if past generations have contributed anything at all of permanent value to the sum of human knowledge and culture; we must concede the ability of the educated man to do most things better than the uneducated man. It doesn't affect the question to say that much of the matter taught in our educational institutions is false and mischievous. Remove the whole mass of error and there still remains a certain residuum of positive knowledge which is the common heritage of all mankind. Whether in the domain of handicraft or intellectual endeavor the man who has measurably mastered this body of certain knowledge is better equipped for the accomplishment of a given task than the ignorant man. It is, of course, obvious that the manual worker with clear mental vision can see the merits of a proposition better than the "intellectual" who suffers from mental strabismus, but the mere fact that one is a manual worker does not imply that he is clear-headed.

The "intellectual" whose argument has been already noted continues to say: "Making a specialty of thinking they (the "intellectuals") have inevitably developed various phases of Utopianism." That is to say, the runner lost the race because he trained for the contest; the lawyer lost his case because he knew law; the logician drew false conclusions because he studied logic. Naturally, runners lose races, lawyers are defeated and logicians draw false conclusions but more athletes would lose if they didn't train, more cases would be lost to the lawyer if he didn't know law and there would be more false conclusions if we didn't have logicians. It stands to reason, therefore, that without the "intellectuals" we would have had more Utopianism and if the mists



of Utopianism have been dispersed it is the same despised "intellectual" who, with the power of logic and keen analysis, has dispersed them. "The workingman who joins the Socialist Movement," continues our friend, "has in most cases never been a Utopian". That is a purely arbitrary assertion which is probably as far from the truth as the other statements we have subjected to examination. My experience of some years in the party is that the manual worker is decidedly prone to relinquish the bone of fact to grasp at the shadows of Utopian theory.

What we need to realize is that it is in the highest degree mischievous to permit these sneering attacks on the "intellectuals" to go unrebuked. I know of no "intellectual," no man who works with his brain, who has any feeling of hostility for his comrade in the movement who works with his hands, but it is unfortunately true that there exists not a little disposition in the ranks of the "horny-handed" to view with distrust the comrade who may have got a degree at college, filled a pulpit or engaged in the practice of law. If we are to encourage such distrust we might as well begin assailing the engineer for knowing how to run an engine, the chemist for the knowledge of chemistry, the electrician for his knowledge of electricity and so forth. The plain truth of the matter is that the things which make of one an "intellectual" are just as valuable and often more so than the equipment which enables men to run engines, reduce a substance to its elements or harness the forces of nature in the service of man.

It is a spirit of bigotry and proscription, if not contemptible envy, which would seek by sneers to hamper the usefulness to our movement of the men who are "intellectuals". We need sorely the exceptional man, no matter whether he is an artisan, artist or professional man.

The undoubted fact that we have exceptional men to whom we look for special service is in itself proof that the cry against "leaders" and "leadership" in the movement is irrational and unworthy of us. The idiosyncrasy of the time is specialization and democracy is doomed if it shall prove itself incapable of utilizing the specialist. This applies now as it must apply in the Co-operative Commonwealth to come.

More than to any other one factor, perhaps, is the inefficiency of our party organization due to failure to make use of the specialists in our ranks. To the inefficiency resulting from putting square pegs in round holes we have "confusion worse confounded" resulting from the hopeless effort to have the rank and file pass upon every detail of party organization and administration in order to conform to an impossible ideal of democracy. It is manifestly impossible for the rank and file to pass on every technical problem either now or in the Co-operative Commonwealth. And it must be borne in mind that technical problems

are not confined to any one department of human activity. The test of democracy is not that each individual citizen or party member shall be familiar with the details of every problem facing the part or the body politic. The test is in having the intelligence—the old-fashioned quality known as “umption”—to call, to the service of all, the most efficient individuals for the performance of any certain duty.

We have learned this lesson in many things but we need to learn it in everything else. If we desire that a food product shall be analyzed for the detection of poisonous elements we go to a chemist and not a mechanical engineer. Why, then, if we desire an efficient secretary for a party “local” should we not choose a comrade familiar with letter writing and office system instead of “honoring” some comrade with no knowledge whatever of such things?

Of course it is not always a simple matter to determine what comrade can discharge a given task most efficiently and we can rely upon only one rule: Efficiency produces order and results; inefficiency produces disorder and lack of results. Efficiency spells success; inefficiency spells failure. We are prone to denounce “business” and everything connected with it as evil, but the party will not begin to do what it may do until it adopts business methods of organization and applies the business principle of getting the best man for the accomplishment of a certain work. This must be observed not only in selecting comrades to attend to the various details of party work but in the nomination of candidates as well. Even if we have not the ghost of a show of winning we are derelict in selecting candidates if we do not act with a view to the most effective discharge of the duties of the office for which nomination is made.

Our movement has demagogues just as the old parties have them and while there is precious poor picking in the movement in the way of “graft” these demagogues all too often monopolize the “honors” attached to party position and stand in the way of comrades with special and technical equipment who should be drafted to perform the party’s work. It is these demagogues who are responsible for the grotesque misapplication of many of the noble principles of democracy. They breed dissension and distrust by shouting that the collective wisdom of the party, or any subdivision thereof, is greater than the wisdom of any individual party member. That is only a half truth. In a day of specialization one party member with expert knowledge on any particular subject may know more than all the rest of the party membership composed of men not familiar with that subject. It may be a severely technical subject requiring years to master it. Does democracy demand that we shall not avail ourselves of this one man’s knowledge until all the rest of the party membership

have gone to school and mastered that particular subject? Preposterous, of course, but we go right along doing things of the same sort in our party organization. We demand, for instance, that all committees shall be elected, instead of being appointed, when the chances are that the chairman enjoys a familiarity with the qualifications of certain members for service on that particular committee that the bulk of the members in the meeting might not be able to acquire in weeks. I would be the last one to deny the necessity for placing the proper safeguards about the exercise of power, but those safeguards lie in seeing that power, when it is exercised, inures to the collective good. Let the chairman appoint his committee. The function of the collectivity is wisely to select the chairman. If the collectivity hasn't the intelligence to select one honest and efficient chairman why, in the name of common sense, should it be credited with the intelligence to select three or any other number of honest and efficient committeemen?

We are simply compelled to delegate power to individuals equipped by training in college, office or shop for the efficient discharge of certain work. If we do not so delegate power we will be a mob undeserving the consideration of civilized men. Accordingly we must sternly rebuke the disposition to question the honesty or efficiency of any party member simply because he does not happen to be a factory worker. Similarly we must rebuke any disposition to question the honesty or efficiency of the factory worker as such. The horny-handed proletarian, however, is already standing proudly on the pedestal and needs no defense. I have no disposition to pull him down because he is a factory worker, but if he is inefficient, and is hurting the party by his conspicuous position, I will pull him down instantaneously if it is in my power even though he belongs to all the trade unions. If the most efficient man to take his place should happen to be an intellectual—a brain worker engaged in work not susceptible of the trade union form of organization—I would as promptly elevate him to the position of prominence.

In the sense of availing ourselves of the superior wisdom and efficiency of our gifted individual party members we must have "leaders" and "leadership" and we should be proud and happy to honor those who render exceptional service. Just now we need trained fighters and captains as we shall need trained administrators in the Co-operative Commonwealth. Give me, with the rest of the collectivity, the power of keeping a check on the leaders to compel them to serve us all and I, for one, will prefer following a Moses into the Promised Land to wandering leaderless forever in the Wilderness where the manna long ago ceased to fall.

CHARLES DOBBS.



## Pause and Consider.



SOCIALIST unity has been urged in the United States since the Paris Congress affirmed by resolution that the desirable thing would be one united party in each country.

In this resolution the Congress merely expressed what all sincere socialists desire. We all want unity. So do we all want Socialism.

But there is many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip. Between the thing we want and the existing conditions there stretches away a long line of years, in which we must learn how to get the thing we want. And most of us have yet to learn that just as the development from Capitalism to Socialism is a historical growth, so is the development from working class division to working class unity a process of historical development.

You can't get Socialism by mere resolution. Neither can you get socialist unity or labor union unity by mere resolution. That is, you can't get it that way until the time is ripe for it, and then a resolution to that effect is simply a recognition of facts which have become inevitable. But merely to pass a resolution expressing a desire for a certain thing without at the same time indicating the way in which the desire may be accomplished is more harmful than useful.

Our ideas are not wholly and solely controlled by economic conditions. Quite aside from the fact that earth's nature and the universe prove often stronger, and are in certain respects always stronger, than economic conditions in human societies, there is also the further fact that often past traditions and the habit of shallow thinking "weigh like a nightmare upon the brains of the living". For this reason Marx wisely said no more than that *in the last analysis* the economic conditions determine the general trend of human ideas.

Thus it may happen that some of our ideas run directly in opposition to the demands made by economic conditions upon our reason. This may lead us into pitfalls, from which we cannot extricate ourselves until after long suffering and with the loss of the results of years of patient and hard work for Socialism.

Every socialist with the merest smattering of Marx knows that it is an evidence of utopian thought to attempt to get Socialism at a time when Capitalism has just begun, or even before that. But it is no less utopian to attempt to get socialist unity

at a time when the whole socialist movement is still torn apart by such wide differences upon points of tactics, that nothing but a misunderstanding of fundamental principles can account for them.

Of course, even a disagreement on points of principle need not necessarily be an obstacle to the accomplishment of unity. But the first prerequisite in such a case is that all sides show a spirit of conciliation and a willingness to discuss questions of principle in a scientific manner with a view to convincing either the one or the other side and bringing one of them to the acceptance of the views of the other. It is evident, that even this would require years of discussion and a mutual preparation of minds on both sides for united work, before unity could be actually inaugurated.

So long as one side claims to be absolutely in the right, as the spokesmen of the Socialist Labor Party do, so long as these comrades speak with dogmatic authority in the name of Marx, whom they misrepresent, so long as they claim that the Socialist Labor Party is the only truly revolutionary labor organization in the land, so long as they urge unity with the professed intention of "regenerating" the Socialist Party and rescuing its ranks and file from the pernicious and traitorous influence of "fakirs, compromisers", etc., etc., in short, so long as they persist in their policy of slander, misrepresentation, dogmatism, intolerance, conceit and presumption, which they have followed in the past, just so long is the basis for even the preliminary ground work of unity lacking.

This is said without a shadow of an insinuation that the comrades of the Socialist Labor Party are insincere, or that their spokesmen are doubledealers. On the contrary, I believe that the majority of them are earnest and enthusiastic workers for the cause. But they are under the influence of men, who, though they may be sincere socialists, are by nature intolerant, bigoted, unscrupulous, slanderous, narrowmindedly fanatic, and above all incapable of grasping the meaning of the Marxian theories.

I can affirm this last fact without exposing myself to the objection that I am claiming for the Socialist Party what I would deny to the Socialist Labor Party. We have the testimony of Engels himself to prove that the Socialist Labor Party under the theoretical leadership of its present teachers is not in line with Marxism, while the Socialist Party represents Marx and him as they wished to be represented.

For instance, on September 30, 1891, Engels wrote to comrade F. A. Sorge: "The 'People' is not worth looking at. For a long time I have not met with a paper so full of ridiculous trash." The "People" was then under the same intellectual leadership which led the Socialist Labor Party to combat the

existing trade unions and which left the wrecks of many a good and promising working class organization in its wake.

At the time when Engels wrote this letter, the element controlled by the dogmatists of the Socialist Labor Party were boycotting Engels' works and vilifying and slandering those who were working in co-operation with him. The "People" was paraded as the only true Marxian paper, and the papers supported by Engels were subjected to all sorts of aspersions and sneers questioning their scientific standing.

No wonder that Engels wrote to Sorge on May 12, 1894: "The Social Democratic Federation (England) shares with your German American socialists the distinction of being the only parties that have accomplished the feat of reducing the Marxian theory of development to a rigid orthodoxy, into which the working people are not supposed to work themselves up out of their own class feeling, but which they are to swallow at once as an article of faith and without any development."

Schlüter was then carrying on a controversy in the "Volkszeitung" against the "Vorwärts", the German organ of the Socialist Labor Party, and Engels stood with him and his co-workers in the entire fight against the Socialist Labor Party. If necessary, the complete proofs of this state of affairs can be supplied in such a way as to settle for ever the assumption of those leaders of the Socialist Labor Party, who claim to be speaking in the name of Marx.

If, then, the Socialist Labor Party does not represent Marxian Socialism correctly, if its leaders do not work in harmony with the expressed views of Engels, they must necessarily be representing a Socialism peculiarly their own. Of course, that cannot be counted against them. Marxism itself is still in its beginnings as a theory, and it leaves plenty of room for further development. Since neither Marx nor Engels has ever claimed to be the embodiment of all wisdom, the younger generations of socialists have vast opportunities for contributing new and fertile ideas to the ground work laid by the founders of scientific Socialism. But before we can build anything new upon this foundation, we must have understood the old. A good many controversies might have been spared to us, if all sides had been able to bear this in mind and realize its significance. Many of the new claims advanced by some of the younger socialists against some theories of Marx were based upon a misunderstanding of his position. On the other hand, some claims made by younger men on a sound basis were refuted by the older Marxians in a way which bore the earmarks of shallow reading and preconceived aversion.

Certainly most of us younger men have still much to learn about the theories of Marx. And even if we have grasped some



of these theories and built upon them some new pioneer work, this is not proof that we have understood the other Marxian theories. On the other hand, the older Marxians are far too prone to read the works of younger comrades superficially and declare offhand that the new thinkers do not understand Marx correctly, simply because the new ideas advanced by these young thinkers run counter in one respect or another to long cherished views of the older comrades.

This tendency is quite universal, throughout the socialist movement, even among comrades of the same party. And if it is difficult for comrades of the same party to come to an agreement on such theoretical matters, merely because there is not enough close study of each others' position, it is still far more difficult for members of different parties like the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party, who are not merely divided by questions of principle and tactics, but even more by long years of personal controversy, which make an unbiased and scientific discussion almost impossible.

The present time seems to me particularly inopportune for any definite steps to unite the two parties. More than ever has the situation been complicated by the controversies arising from the Industrial Workers of the World. And let us not forget that the original cause, which led to the split in the old Socialist Labor Party and to the organization of the present Socialist Party, was precisely the Anti-Marxian position taken by the orthodox leaders of the Socialist Party in the matter of the relations of the economic organizations of the working class to its political organizations. Are not these same elements, who were then disavowed by Engels and his Marxian comrades, once more assuming the role of dogmatic teachers, who would cram industrial unionism down everybody's throat as an article of faith and without any historical development? Are they not doing this once again in the name of Marx, contrary to his own theory? Do we want these comrades in our party, so that they may carry the germs of disruption into it as they did into the Industrial Workers of the World?

We are still far from agreement on the question of industrial unionism, even within our own party. Much has still to be done among ourselves in the way of mutual clarification and understanding. Never did the habit of one-sided and superficial consideration of another comrade's position manifest itself more flagrantly than it did when the Industrial Workers of the World was launched.

The initiative in the creation of this new industrial organization was taken by the independent western labor unions outside of the American Federation of Labor. The overwhelming majority of the signers of the Chicago Manifesto were labor unionists. A few members of the Socialist Party, who were not

labor unionists, participated in this movement only after they had been expressly invited to give their opinion as exponents of Marxism. A few others, who were neither Marxians nor labor unionists, were then working as organizers of the American Labor Unions, and were invited on account of their known enthusiasm and devotion to the social revolution.

The position taken by practically all the signers of the Chicago Manifesto was that industrial unionism must come as a historical necessity; that the new organisation was not intended as an attack upon the American Federation of Labor, nor as a rival organisation, but merely as a center for those advanced labor unionists, who for various reasons did not feel at home in the American Federation of Labor; that it was impossible to foresee what course the evolution toward industrial unionism would take, and that for this reason it was a matter of selfprotection and an assistance to the working class revolution to gather all independent labor unionists into an industrial union until such time as the development of industrial unionism inside of the American Federation of Labor should make a united industrial unionism possible; that this united industrial unionism might come either through a disintegration of the American Federation of Labor, if it should persist in its policy of frowning upon those of its affiliated bodies that had already adopted some form of industrial unionism, and in that case the industrial organisation of the American Federation of Labor would gather around the Industrial Workers of the World; or it might come by a gradual transformation of the American Federation of Labor into an industrial organisation, and in that case the Industrial Workers of the World and the American Federation of Labor would be able to unite.

But something happened, which most of the signers of the Chicago Manifesto had not anticipated. Only comrade A. M. Simons and myself called the attention of the other signers of the Manifesto to this eventuality, but we were not heeded. This something was the role played by the Socialist Labor Party in the labor union movement.

Comrade Simons warned the other comrades that it would be wise to exclude the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance from the proposed constitutional convention, because they would come into the organisation only for the purpose of disrupting it. While I would not go so far as to say that this was the purpose of those comrades, I certainly agreed with comrade Simons that this would be the probable result of their coming into the organisation. Therefore I like wise asked the other signers of the Manifesto to be careful, in an article written for the American Labor Union Journal (*The Voice of Labor*), in which I gave them a brief summary of the

past history of the Socialist Labor Party and of the leading men in it. I advised that delegates from those two organisations should not be admitted unless they expressly endorsed the principles proclaimed in the Manifesto.

But these warnings fell upon deaf ears. Some of the signers of the Chicago Manifesto had strong leanings toward the Socialist Labor Party, and they happened just then to find more credence than we did. The general sentiment of the comrades was that the Socialist Labor party and the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance were not strong enough to harm the new industrial organisation, even if they wanted to, that the leaders of these organisations should be given a fair chance to redeem themselves and blot out their past record, and that it would be easier to control them inside of the new organisation than to exclude them from it and fight them on the outside.

I was myself inclined to lean toward this opinion, but only because I thought that the Western Federation of Miners was a solid and impregnable organisation without any significant internal dissensions. As it turned out later, there was an incipient division even in the Western Federation of Miners, due partly to personal jealousies, partly to differences arising out of questions of tactics. When the time was opportune, this division gave to the Socialist Labor Party and its sympathizers the necessary strength to split the Industrial Workers of the World and to prove that that party did not intend to blot out its past record, but would rather persevere in its policy of sowing discord and disruption, always in the name of truly revolutionary theory and practice.

The general attitude of the Industrial Workers of the World, as expressed and summarized above, was not strictly adhered to by some of the signers of the Chicago Manifesto. No sooner had the Socialist Labor Party grafted the dying remains of its Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance upon the Industrial Workers of the World, than it began a campaign of vilification and hostility against some of the craft unions of the American Federation of Labor. Instead of leaving the conversion and transformation of such craft unions to the socialists within the American Federation of Labor, as a reasonable division of labor would suggest, and devoting themselves to the organisation of such working people as belonged to no organisation or fell away of their own account from the American Federation of Labor, the Socialist Labor Party element assailed the American Federation of Labor, resumed the old scabbing policy of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, and at the same time strove to expel those comrades from the Industrial Workers of the World, who did not sanction these methods.

Others, again, began to belittle political action, flirt with



Anarchism, and declare industrial unionism to be the only truly revolutionary and invincible labor organisation. Most of the members of the Socialist Labor Party repudiated this anarchist position. But some of them went to the no less inconsistent extreme of claiming that industrial unionism would have to be built up first before any truly revolutionary party could become the political expression of the working class.

Needless to say that both comrade Simons and myself combatted these vagaries vigorously, wherever opportunity presented itself. But this did not prevent some of our comrades in our party from saddling upon our shoulders the sins of those whom we were opposing. One has but to read the controversies in the New York "Worker" concerning industrial unionism, in order to see that even comrades, who on other occasions demonstrated their Marxian scholarship by excellent writings lost all faculty of critical reasoning when turning their attention to us. Some of them attributed to us the position of the anarchists or of the comrades in the Socialist Labor Party, against whom we were persistently upholding the Marxian position.

Our view, which we justified on the ground of historical materialism, was that it was unwise to stand exclusively for the policy of boring for industrial unionism and socialism only inside of the American Federation of Labor at a time when vast bodies of organized laborers stood for these things outside of that organisation. We held that we could but recognise the existing state of things, try to understand the tendency of its future development, and in the meantime keep hands off as a party and let both the policy of working inside and outside of the American Federation of Labor take their course. On the other hand, the very comrades who falsely charged us with endorsing the Industrial Workers of the World at the expense of the American Federation of Labor had been instrumental in fastening upon the Socialist Party a trade union resolution, which evaded the question of industrial unionism entirely, took no notice of the developments within the American labor movement, and contained a clause, which implied a censure of the independent labor unions and a covert endorsement of the American Federation of Labor. This last fact has been continually denied, or at least the intention has been disavowed of producing any such effect. But the fact remains that this impression was produced and that an increasing number of comrades place this construction upon the trade union resolution of the Socialist Party.

Had the Industrial Workers of the World accomplished nothing else, it would at least deserve credit for bringing the question of industrial unionism so prominently to the fore, that even the conservative element in the American Federation of Labor had to acknowledge its existence and coming ascendancy,

and that it will be impossible for the next national convention of the Socialist Party to shirk a square answer to this question.

I mention these facts mainly in the interest of historical truth and for the purpose of illustrating, how the main point of a controversy may be completely overshadowed by false interpretations due to shallow reading and onesided thinking. This question of industrial unionism shows very plainly, how difficult it is to come to an understanding about the prevailing tendencies of social development, so long as the critical spirit of scientific penetration and objectivity is not better cultivated among us. When Marx and Engels are under discussion, all the arts of interpretation and the most liberal latitude are invoked in the case of doubtful passages. But when we are under discussion, we meet with the peculiar phenomenon, that our opponents place the most ridiculous interpretations upon our statements and misunderstand even the clearest passages.

These difficulties will be with us for a good while yet. So long as they are, it would be folly to create still greater troubles for ourselves by amalgamating our organisation with another one, which is known to make a specialty of perverted controversy. Not only would it be still harder for us to agree upon points which now divide us in our own organisation, but we should also be loaded down with the weight of other controversies, which we have happily outgrown, but which are the peculiar hobbies of the Socialist Labor Party. We should be thrown into controversy about centralised or decentralised organisation, about official party papers, about the question of immediate demands in our platform, etc. This would threaten the security of the Chicago Daily Socialist, and of some of the most promising weeklies of our party, for the dogmatists would have no difficulty in finding comrades in our party who are opposed to the present staff of the Daily, just as they had no difficulty in finding comrades in the Industrial Workers of the World, who were opposed to the existing executive staff. We should be hard put to it to hold our organisation together, factional fights would increase, our energy would be frittered away to the detriment of agitation and organisation.

This would be the natural result of unity at the present time, even if the question of industrial unionism were not just now assuming some new aspects, which promise to complicate the situation still more.

After the Industrial Workers of the World had been split, the Sherman wing changed its tactics and departed from the original intentions of the signers of the Manifesto to such an extent that it almost returned to the old policy of "no politics in the union". On the other hand, the Trautmann wing cultivated politics in the style of the Socialist Labor Party and devoted itself

to economic organisation in such a manner, that the majority of the Western Federation of Miners gradually drew away from them. The end was that the Western Federation of Miners held aloof from both wings of the split Industrial Workers of the World, and steps are now being taken to organize an effective industrial organisation. Eventually it is not impossible, in view of the action taken with regard to the industrial organisations by the recent convention of the American Federation of Labor, that the Western Federation of Miners may affiliate with that organisation, or at least draw closer to it. This would be a distinct gain for industrial unionism and Socialism.

But if this should happen and the Socialist Party should then unite with the Socialist Labor Party, the western comrades would find themselves once more face to face with the same friction, from which they had just escaped, only they would then have it in their political organisation instead of the economic one. But the trouble would be the same as before. The interests of industrial unionism and of the Socialist Party, instead of being advanced, would be injured. The only one to gain in the end would be the Socialist Labor Party faction. Unity under such conditions cannot mean anything else but new disruption of the political organisation, a loss of sympathizers and members of the economic organisations, and a general reduction of our importance as a social factor.

Most of the rank and file of the Socialist Labor Party are new in the movement, know little or nothing of Marxian theories beyond the distorted versions placed before them in their official publications, are not familiar with the history of international Socialism in general and of American Socialism in particular. In the Socialist Party, on the other hand, we have now a goodly number of welltrained and well informed comrades, who can take care of the normal influx of newcomers. But if we unite with the Socialist Labor Party, we shall at once double our difficulties, because we should be admitting a group of comrades, who are under the influence of men adverse to us, so that we should have to divide our energies between fighting them and educating our new members.

Even if the delegates of the Socialist Labor Party should promise to drop all their typical hobbies and come into our organisation unconditionally, what assurance have we that they would keep their promises? Who will believe the promises of men, who have shown themselves callous against all considerations considered moral by most people and unscrupulous in the choice of their means?

Let me repeat that I do not wish to pronounce any moral condemnation in these words. Those comrades are what they must be. Neither would I pronounce any moral sentence upon



a rattlesnake for biting me, if I got to close to it. But knowing what a rattlesnake is, I keep out of its reach.

Before we unite with the Socialist Labor Party, let the question of industrial unionism develop to a point where it shall no longer threaten to become a new cause of disruption. Meanwhile let the comrades of the Socialist Labor Party give better proofs of their willingness to co-operate like comrades than they have heretofore. There is no particular necessity for uniting now. We have gotten along very well without the Socialist Labor Party and shall get along quite well without it for a while longer. Let them improve their theoretical knowledge in such a way that we shall not have to educate their teachers along with their rank and file. Let them get in line with Marxian methods particularly in the matter of industrial unionism and show by their actions that they have definitely abandoned the policies, which have spelled ruin for them and others.

Until they do that, I for one shall look upon all offers of unity from their side with suspicion and oppose any attempt to humor them, that may be made by inexperienced or overconfident comrades in our party.

By all means let us work for unity. But let us do it in such manner that we may assist the general clarification of minds in both parties and not place ourselves in a position, in which this work of clarification will not only be hampered, but in which we shall also be compelled to make front against enemies inside and outside. Let us prepare for unity so well that it will remain unity after it has been officially proclaimed.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

## The Economic Aspects of the Negro Problem.

(Continued.)



THE FEW FACTS mentioned show what an influence slavery began to exercise upon the southern white society. Another evident result was the loss of habit for intensive effort and work, so necessary and essential in the life of a colonist. A traveler through the Southern states in 1778 has noticed, that "the influence of slavery upon Southern habits is peculiarly exhibited in the prevailing indolence of the people. It would seem as if the poor white man would almost rather starve than work, because the Negro works."

But while slavery was having such harmful, demoralizing effects upon the white population of the South, it proved to be a school of civilization for the savage Negro. The Negro, who had lived many years on American soil, or the Negro who was born on American soil, and still more the Negro with a greater or lesser admixture of white blood, was even in the beginning of the 18th century vastly different from the newly imported African Negro. The difference was noticed in 1767 by the English missionary whom we have quoted above. The Negro who remained in the household of the master, doing domestic service, felt this civilizing influence more than the Negro slave in the field. That was one reason, among many others, why the Negro in the North felt it more than the Negro in the South.

The importation of new Negroes from Africa therefore called forth different feelings in the South and the North. New, wild Negroes everywhere presented a dangerous, threatening element, but in the South they were necessary, while in the North they were useless, since a new Negro remained for many years unfit for domestic labor. The opposition to the importation of new slaves, which existed in all the colonies, was therefore much stronger in the North than in the South.

Beginning with 1681 dozens of laws were passed by the various colonies limiting or altogether prohibiting by means of high import duties, the importation of new slaves. The reason given for these measures in the North was usually the desire to restrict the growth of the anti-christian institution,

but the South was more frank in admitting the possible danger of an excessive increase in the number of slaves to the peace of society. Judging from this legislation, the struggle against slavery as an institution in the North began as early as the 17th century, but in reality the moral antagonism to slavery in those days seems to have been a very weak factor, since the laws of Massachusetts prohibited or taxed heavily the importation of Negroes into that commonwealth, but permitted the enterprising Yankees to continue their slave trade with the Southern colonies. Thus Massachusetts having established a very high duty on importation of Negroes in the beginning of the 18th century, nevertheless thought it necessary to return this duty at re-exportation, which made this state the main slave market. This materially affects the rights of the Northern colonies to the claim of a more humane attitude towards the slavery question.

Nevertheless, in view of the many economic and social causes indicated above, the first protests against slavery as such, had to arise in the North. Only a small minority could possibly be directly interested in the slave trade. The results of civilization and progress could more easily manifest themselves there, where the economic advantages of slavery were not so great as to suffocate all manifestations of protest. In any case, it is hardly necessary to say that towards the end of the 18th century these moral objections against the system of slavery had almost no practical effect upon the distribution of slavery. Nevertheless, the fragmentary information of such objections have a very great historical interest.

The first serious and sincere agitation in favor of suppression of slavery came from the Pennsylvania Quakers, that remarkable body of people of high moral principles.

John Woolman, (1720-1784), and still more Anthony Beneset were ardent preachers of the immorality of slavery as it existed in the South. Woolman protested mainly against the excessive work of the slaves, against the denial to them of a Christian education, while Beneset compared the condition of the slaves with that of the mode of life of the Negro tribes in Africa, which he pictured in rather sympathetic colors, and insisted upon the **Human** rights of the Negroes. But all these efforts, as far as they were directed towards a practical aim, and did not satisfy themselves with moral teachings, aimed only a reduction of the slave trade and of the importation of new slaves.

It is true, that Beneset, like the famous John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, went as far as to suggest the advisability of liberating the slaves, but they scarcely expected anyone to follow this advice, and they did not therefore ex-



pect the appearance of the Negro problem, that is, the problem of the free Negro. They did not therefore try to solve that problem. Their preaching was purely religious and ethical, but not political.

In the North where the number of slaves by that time was small, where free Negroes side by side with the few slaves performed domestic service, the solution of the slavery problem did not present such difficulties as in the South, and there the preachings of Besenet and others had a much stronger influence. All through the seventies of the 18th century the slaves of Massachusetts began to fight for their liberty through the courts, insisting that the English common law did not permit of the institution of slavery. Frequently the juries took the same attitude. The revolutionary epoch brought the abolition of slavery by law in all the Northern colonies or states. The influence of these new thoughts began to be felt in the South as well; opposition to slavery became a sign of progressive thought during the revolutionary era.

The burning speeches and writings of Thomas Paine about the rights of man, the great formula, "All men are born free and equal," the whole theory of natural rights could not but have a strong influence upon contemporary thought. Not only Franklin, Hamilton, Jay, and Adams in the North, but also Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Henry in the South, were convinced opponents of slavery in principle.

It is true, that they continued to own their slaves, for without them life in the South would have been very uncomfortable indeed; besides, the liberation of slaves needed, not only principles, but also heroism and self-sacrifice. In his famous Declaration of Independence Jefferson had originally included a few sentences, accusing England of the shame of introducing slavery in the colonies for its personal advantage. But Adams, the Northerner opponent of slavery, influenced Jefferson to strike out this paragraph, so as not to call forth the displeasure of the South.

But even among these "best citizens of the South" the radical tendencies were not caused by any greater respect for the Negro as a human being. It is no exaggeration to say, that the opinion of these men about the Negro was, if anything, a less favorable one than those entertained by the convinced slave holders. If Jefferson protested against the institution of slavery he did it more in the interest of the white population than of the colored one. The strongest argument against slavery was the consideration that it led to an increase of the black population. Slavery develops in the slaveowner a crude and cruel disposition and immorality.

"The children of the white folks are brought up in asso-

ciation with the Negro slaves with results detrimental to the development of the children." All this was mentioned by Jefferson, while the Southern slave owners did not all see any harm in such association. That the Negroes represented a hopelessly inferior race was not at all doubted by Jefferson, who saw the solution of the Negro problem in the liberation of the slaves, with their subsequent return to Africa.

Such was the attitude of the various elements of the Southern population towards the Negro, slavery, and the Negro problem. There remains the interesting question, of the actual treatment of the slaves by their owners. To a great extent it was a personal matter, and depended a great deal upon the personality of the individual slave owners. Nevertheless, it may be reasonably assumed that disregarding individual peculiarities some average conditions asserted themselves. In general, the treatment of the slaves was kinder in the North than in the South, perhaps mainly because in the North the slaves were domestic servants. A great many Negroes were employed in the homes of their owners in the South as well, and these also received more favorable treatment. Bonds of friendship often arose between these slaves and their owners, the slave owner's children grew in the society of the slave, and often developed almost filial or fraternal feelings for their nurses or the comrades of their youth. From this class of Negroes the majority of the freedmen in the North as well as in the South were recruited. Into this class the majority of the Mulattoes and Quadroons were drafted; for in general, the most intelligent and civilized were chosen for domestic labor. These Negroes had exceptional advantages; their kindhearted mistresses took pains to convert them to Christianity, when towards the end of the eighteenth century the prohibition of such missionary work was removed.

But these patriarchal relations were limited to domestic servants as early as the end of the 18th century. Even then the great majority of the slaves were utilized for work in the field. These Negroes could not enjoy the advantages of personal relations with their masters; in their treatment the business principles predominated; and the object was to extract as much labor of them as possible, while making their support as cheap as possible. Here the point of view which considered the Negro a beast was the most convenient one, and undoubtedly influenced the treatment of the Negro, while the conditions of life which were the result of this treatment served to corroborate the beast theory. Into this group the newly imported African Negroes were admitted, and this continuous admixture of perfectly savage Negroes to the semi-

civilized one could not, of course, serve to elevate the general level of civilization of the mass of the field Negroes.

The efforts of the white man to elevate this level of civilization were not many; on the contrary there was a strong opposition to all efforts in that direction, especially as far as the field Negro was concerned. In the beginning, even Christianity was a forbidden fruit, and this was defended by the curious argument that the ownership of Christian slaves would be against the spirit of the English law. But the clergy in its zeal for missionary work and the salvation of black souls, convinced the slave owners that there was no antagonism between Christianity and slavery. In the defense of this theory the dogma of a lower race, destined to serve the higher white race, proved a useful argument; thus Christianity became a strong force in support of the institution of slavery and a force of little civilizing value for the slaves. The English clergyman quoted, who wrote in 1768, points out that there are two kinds of Christianity and education, one kind which might inculcate dangerous ideas in the head of the Negro, and the other kind which will convince him of the essential justice of his position. Educated clergymen were a luxury which was granted only to the Negroes about the house; for the Negroes of the fields black preachers were considered sufficient, and those were naturally preferred who were ready to preach them the gospel, that religion demanded slavery, patience, obedience and industry. Notwithstanding all these precautions the majority of the slaves in the end of the 18th century was still unbaptized.

Even when the Negroes were baptized, their marital relations were but seldom solemnized by any religious ceremony, and even in those cases where such a ceremony was performed, its commands were absolutely disregarded by the slave owners. Incidents similar to that which serves as a plot for the famous novel of Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, were undoubtedly more common in the eighteenth century than at the time, which the novel purports to describe, but in those earlier days they did not call forth any serious objection, and did not cause such deep anguish in view of the rather weak attachment of the primitive Negro to his wife and children. This weakness of the family bonds in the opinion of Southern society, was sufficient excuse of the infringements of family ties. But in reality the moral effect of these acts was much more harmful in the middle of the 18th century, than one hundred years ago. In the latter cases they were only isolated cases of cruelty which caused considerable suffering to individual families, but in the earlier days they



undermined the family morality of an entire race, instead of inculcating moral ideas.

In Africa the Negro lived in the normal stage of polygamy, which probably was no worse than the polygamy of the Mohammedans.

If the morality of the men did not reach the height of European ideals, nevertheless polygamy in all probability proved an effective safety valve. When wives were personal property the coveting of another man's wife like the coveting of another man's property called forth severe punishment. With the exception of the custom of offering one's wives to one's guest, the Negro women like the women of all polygamous races probably were more moderate in their sexual life than their white sisters. The total and sudden destruction of the polygamous family without its substitution by a protected monogamous family could but lead to one result: irregular and promiscuous sexual relations. The African Negro was not familiar with prostitution. The Negro woman, who began as the possession of the slave owner or the overseer, and then changed hands from one owner to another, and changed husbands each time she changed her boss, and was often forced into separation from her children, even if it happened without any serious protest from her side, gradually fell to the level of a prostitute. And having caused this sexual demoralization the Southern slave owner pointed to, this lack of moral principle as an example of racial inferiority.

What wonder, that under the influence of these factors there grew the contempt for the Negro slave, which was later transferred upon the Negro freedman? Side by side with special legislation aimed at the Negro slave, the codes of the American colonies contained provisions intended for the free Negro. In the early days the freeing of the slave depended only upon the good will of the owners; and this remained the law in the Northern colonies up to the very liberation of all the slaves; but in the South an excessive number of freed slaves soon began to be considered a menace to the principle of slavery, and so the manumission of slave was made dependent upon administrative permission, to be issued by the governor. A wandering Negro had to prove that he was a free man; failing to do this he was to be sold at public auction. This is the final step in an interesting evolution of opinions. Towards the end of the 18th century the principle was established that "only Negroes could be slaves"; from this the next conclusion was drawn, that "Negroes could be slaves only"; and that each exception to that rule had to be judged on its own merits; besides the economic and social condi-

tions of the Negro freedman in the South were scarcely better than those of the Negro slave. He was not permitted to travel from one colony into another; he was not permitted to own land, nor to practice professions and most trades, so that about the only trade open to him was that of a hired agricultural laborer, for wages which hardly provided him with a better living than what he had as a slave. Free Negroes could not appear as witnesses against white men, could not enter military service, had no political rights, but had to pay all the taxes on an equal basis with the white neighbors.

I. M. ROBBINS.

(To be continued).

## EDITOR'S CHAIR

**The Political Outlook.** The size of the Socialist Party vote, while not a matter of such vital importance as many take it to be, is always a matter of interest to socialists. And when all is said and done, the size of the vote depends far more on causes beyond our control than on our methods of propaganda, no matter how good nor how bad these may be. Let us take a brief glance at some of the factors that may help or hinder us this year. Our advantage four years ago was that Roosevelt and Parker alike stood for things as they were, so that the easiest way for the discontented Bryan men to voice their discontent was to vote for Debs. Now Bryan himself seems sure to be a candidate, and he will surely win back some of the old admirers who were with him in 1904. But he has been growing safe and sane these last four years, and meanwhile the Republican administration has been waging spectacular war on the Bad Trusts. So if Taft gets the Republican nomination, it should not be hard for us to show that the two old parties stand for the same things and that working people who want something different should come to us. If on the other hand the Magnates of the Bad Trusts succeed in putting up their own man in place of Taft, then doubtless Bryan's Third Battle will be as thrilling to the little business men and to the wage-workers with small-capitalist minds as was the first. In that case the labor conference of which our associate editor writes so hopefully on another page may even be stampeded for Bryan, and the socialist vote may drop to something like the number of revolutionists who know what they want. But this number is growing all the time, and the capitalists are giving us invaluable help from day to day in adding to its strength.

**Two Points of View.** When the Eisenachers and Lassallians buried the hatchet and consolidated into the Social Democratic Party of Germany, Karl Marx, an exile in England, protested. But the event seems to have proved that Marx was wrong and the German comrades were right. We are reminded of this by the contrast between the elaborate argument by Ernest Untermann contributed to this month's Review and the terse editorial by A. M. Stirton which we clip for our News and Views department from a recent issue of *The Wage Slave*. Untermann is an exile in the mountains of Idaho, cut off from active work in the Party as completely as was Marx in 1875. Stirton is in the midst of the fight in the one Western state (Michigan) where the strength of the Socialist Labor Party as compared with our own party strength is the greatest, and where therefore the question of uniting or not uniting is of more practical importance than elsewhere. (And here it should be remembered that the motion for a unity conference was endorsed by the state



committee of the Socialist Party of New York, the state in which probably half the membership of the S. L. P. is located.) We have not space for a complete review of the arguments on both sides. But Untermann's in our opinion represents the view of a scholar impatient of criticism and taking past controversies too seriously, while Stirton impresses us as a man in close touch with the vital revolutionary elements of the present hour. Only one argument offered by Comrade Untermann requires special comment. He intimates that the rank and file of the S. L. P. are ignorant of socialism as compared with the rank and file of our own party. Our own impression, based on a pretty extended acquaintance with members of both parties, is that the exact reverse is true, as should naturally be expected in view of the fact that the growth of the Socialist Party has been by far the more rapid and that it spreads over much purely agricultural territory. The average S. L. P. member, whatever unpleasant traits he may have, does usually know something of Marx, and if we could have him on the inside instead of the outside, he would be a valuable help in clearing up the ideas of new converts. With this work in hand, he would have less time left for hair-splitting, and the union of forces would thus make for general efficiency all around. Old animosities are of very small importance as compared with effective party work. Let us get together if we can.

**How to Get Socialist Unity.** As we go to press, word comes that the National Committee of the Socialist Party has defeated Lee's motion authorizing the National Executive Committee to meet a committee of seven elected by the Socialist Labor Party to confer over terms of union. It has also adopted Berger's motion:

"That the sections and members of the Socialist Labor Party be invited to join our Party individually or in sections, and make their applications to our respective locals. All persons applying to pledge themselves as individuals to accept our Platform and our tactics."

It is hardly likely that this action will meet with any general and immediate response on the part of the Socialist Labor Party. The little band of enthusiasts who have strained their scanty resources for years to keep up their organization, for the sake of things that seemed vital to them, will naturally object to being swallowed so unceremoniously. Why not do as we did in 1900? The two parties which now make up the Socialist Party were then distinct. The rank and file for the most part wanted to get together, but the executive committees failed to agree, and a presidential campaign was on. What we did was to unite on the same candidates, elect joint local campaign committees wherever both parties were active, and get to work together. By the time the campaign was over, we were so well acquainted that the details of consolidation were easily settled with the best of feeling. The same plan ought to work in 1908. Let the Socialist Party adopt a clear-cut working-class platform, and nominate two clear-headed workingmen for President and Vice-President. Let the Socialist Labor Party endorse the platform and candidates; then let each party, maintaining its own dues-paying organization, join in the work of propaganda and education until November, working together locally wherever possible. Then after election let us take up the question of organic unity again; it will be far easier than now.

**Brains and Atmospheres.** Put a first-class brain, with body and lungs to match, into an atmosphere heavily charged with carbonic acid gas, and it fails to turn out a superior article of brain work. And there are mental atmospheres as well as physical ones. Their

effects are not so speedy, but they are lasting. A brain receives impressions and draws conclusions from them according to the mental atmosphere in which it has moved. This is necessarily so. If a brain had to reason out each time from first principles an interpretation of each message of its senses, it would reach no conclusion till the time for action had gone by. Different mental atmospheres develop different types of brain. There is one of the big capitalist, one of the petty capitalist, the villager (probably Shaw is right in thinking this the commonest American type), one of the collegian and one of the wage-worker in the great machine industry. The Socialist Party of America contains brains of all these types. Each has its own instinctive way of approaching a problem, and each is capable of modifying its instinctive way more or less by conscious effort. We are led to these reflections by the entertaining article from Charles Dobbs, published in this issue. We are not writing this paragraph to defend the comrade criticized; he is quite able to defend himself. What we hope to do here is to suggest a way to distinguish between the "intellectuals" who are worth having and the other kind. Of the social groups we have named over, all but one are survivals from past social stages,—the city proletarian is the vital element of to-day and he comes nearer than any of us to the type which will decide how things shall be done in the near future. Hence we hold that, as a general rule, the proletarian's instinctive estimates of men and measures are more likely to be sound than those of people in the other social groups, unless these last have by persistent effort been able to modify their instinctive ways of thinking into something like the proletarian way. This we believe that Comrade Dobbs himself usually does, and so do some other college-bred men who are now active in the Socialist Party.

**Unionism, Utopian and Scientific.** A correspondent in our News and Views department insists on misunderstanding a signed article by the present editor of the Review which appeared in the December number. Any one who will take the trouble to refer to our article will see that we never said industrial unionism was utopian or futile. On the contrary we hold that industrial unionism is the logical outcome of recent changes in the mode of production. When commodities were mainly produced in small plants by small capitalists, craft unionism was logical and inevitable. Moreover it is always the case that ideas and institutions, like the organs of animals and plants, survive their usefulness for a while; they do not instantly and automatically transform themselves in response to a changed environment. So we find craft unions still the prevailing form of labor organization. But they are growing ineffective, and those that adopt the industrial form will stand the best chance of maintaining themselves in the fight against organized capital. The scientific way for those who see the desirability of industrial unionism to act is to point out this tendency; to show the practical advantages of industrial unionism right here and now, and to get real labor unions, comprising all the workmen in any one plant or industry, to reorganize themselves on an industrial basis. The utopian way is to urge the socialists in the old unions to leave them and organize rival unions, so as to be ready to run the Co-operative Commonwealth when it is voted in. When the campaign for industrial unionism in the United States is started on the scientific basis, we believe that something will happen soon. And the capitalists, as explained in our World of Labor department this month, are doing their share to help things along. Let us be duly grateful, and let us hold up our end the best we can.

## SOCIALISM ABROAD

**Japan.** Persecution after persecution. Arrest after arrest. But the Japanese government can not do any better than to make the socialist movement there ever stronger and brighter. On last December 27th the socialists of Tokio had a well attended meeting at the Yoshidays Hall, Kanda, where they usually met, but unfortunately the police told the owner of the hall that if he continued to rent it to the socialists he would have trouble very soon. So the frightened owner had to refuse the socialists the right to meet there any longer. On the 17th of January Comrades in Tokio, at last, decided to have their weekly meetings in the upstairs of the socialist publishing house, The Heimin Sho oo, where, however, again the police followed their track, and rushed into the house interrupting their meeting. Some of the Comrades became impatient and got up on the roof and made a strong attack on the barbarous action of the police. While at least 3000 people on the streets listened to the fiery speeches of the socialists, half with curiosity and half with enthusiasm, the police sent the message to headquarters, and instantly thirty more policemen were sent to the place and arrested six socialists who opposed them and made speeches. Comrade Osugi, one of the six, had just come out of jail where he had to serve six months' imprisonment for the sake of socialism. The Rodosha, a little monthly sheet of propaganda for February, was devoted to the interest of farmers and made the "farmer special." It is said that the issue was distributed all over the country and made a very effective appeal to the farmers. The Nippon Heiminshinbun—a socialist paper—has been exposing the internal picture of The Osaka Arsenal in its current numbers. The Arsenal is conducted by the government, but the treatment the employees receive there is inexcusably cruel. According to the figures of 1907 there were 11,780 men and 298 women workers employed and the monthly wage they receive in all was 241,200 yen. Wages are paid by the hour. The lowest average sum the men get is 2 sen 8-10 an hour. Women, and children get about 1 sen 8-10 an hour. After its careful investigation the Japanese government had found "seven dangerous Japanese" who at present are residing in the United States. Kilichi Kaneko, who is the publisher of The Socialist Woman, is said to be one of them.

**England.** In English papers of all complexions the chief subject for discussion during the past month has been the resolution adopted by the Laborites in their conference at Hull. It will be remembered that Socialism, defined in the orthodox way, was accepted as "a definite object" of the Labor Party's activity. Certain Socialists



are discontented because the first of their resolutions was voted down, tho a second one, practically the same, received a majority the following day: they object also to the provision that Laborites who stand for election are not to be designated as Socialists. Liberal and Conservative leaders, however, regard the new move as a complete Socialist victory. The defeat of the first motion appears to them in the nature of a blind to the public.

In two ways the Hull resolution is resulting in great good. The Liberals have all along claimed the Laborites as their "advance wing," and some of the Labor Party leaders have evidently had their eye on Liberal cabinet positions. It is easy to see why these latter have refused to profess any principles: principles are liable to prove embarrassing to a man after an office. And these very men have been mistakenly supported by Socialist voters. But now all this must end; already there are signs of cleavage between the servants of God and mammon. Socialist voters will soon know who's who.

But perhaps the most important result of the passage of the resolution is the attention called to the Socialist cause. The public is astounded to find it able to command 510,000 votes. The old party papers are in what the English call a "dead funk." Monthly and quarterly magazines join frantically in the hue and cry. Even the staid old, blue-covered Edinburgh Review is running a series of anti-Socialist articles.

At this writing Parliament has been in session just a month. And a stupid month it has been—except for the humor of the thing. The long promised war against the Lords is yet to begin. There was no mention of it in the address from the throne. Later came the news that it was to be precipitated by the prompt passage of the Scotch Land Holders bill, but now it is rumored that the militant Premier, who was to have led in the struggle, is himself to become a lord.

Colonial affairs are hardly calculated to give the much needed comfort to the ministerial mind. The Transvaal government refuses to modify materially its attitude toward the Hindus. Partially on this account Indian discontent requires constantly more drastic repressive measures. "The word Empire loses its meaning," said a prominent Hindu recently, "when one subject is ill-treated by another." In view of the increasing uneasiness at home and abroad it is hardly to be wondered at that every new by-election goes to the Conservatives by an increased majority.

**France.** In France both Senate and Chamber of Deputies are dealing with troublesome problems. The first of these is the Moroccan policy. On Jan. 30th. a new Sultan, Mulai Hafid, set up in opposition to the old one and so became leader of the anti-French forces. His followers are fighting with religious zeal. The French, under General d'Amade, recently defeated them and destroyed the native town of Settat. So inspirited were the deputies by this and other victories that they voted by a large majority to uphold the ministry in its policy of conquest. Needless to say M. Jaurès made good use of the occasion to exhibit in its full glory this new evidence of the white man's superiority. The latest report from Morocco is of a French defeat.

So far as internal policies are concerned our state Socialists, M. Viviani and the rest, are having a sad time of it. They have managed to cut down the period of military service by a few days—

while the conservatives wept as though universe were growing unstable—but beyond that they have accomplished nothing. Their two great projects, the purchase of the Western Railway and the providing of old age pensions, halt for lack of funds. A commission appointed to investigate the possibility of carrying out the latter measure reports that about 2,699,000 persons would be entitled to pensions: if each of these were to receive two dollars per month the amount required would be \$60,000,000, or more than the whole budget hitherto. The rich, like their English comrades, object to paying added taxes, and the poor can contribute little. Even charity runs foul of the rights of property.

**Germany.** The Social Democrats are devoting their best energies to increasing and directing the discontent which recently found expression in the Berlin demonstrations. Meetings are being held throughout Germany in the interest of electoral reform in Prussia: Socialist periodicals warmly discuss the means to be used if the government remains obdurate. The weight of opinion seems to favor a campaign of education among workingmen and small trades-people.

The feeling against the government is increased by high-handed persecution of Socialists. Not much came of the raid reported in this department last month: one man was sentenced to six weeks imprisonment and another was fined ten marks. But there have been scores of new arrests. The German police are placed at the disposal of the Russian government for the arrest and extradition of revolutionists. This much was proved by the famous Königshütte case. And in the ruthless harrying of native malcontents the German authorities are close seconds to their brethren across the eastern border. Early in January seventeen persons, some of them Russians, were arrested in the house of a Socialist at Charlottenburg, a suburb of Berlin. They are now in prison awaiting trial. More recently in Leipzig a socialist debating club was broken up by the police and its leading members were measured and photographed for the rogues' gallery. The Russian Socialist Party has recently published a categorical statement of its opposition to Anarchist tactics, especially to terrorism. This statement has been approved of and widely published in Germany. Nevertheless everyone opposed to the German government is described as an Anarchist and proceeded against though he were a terrorist.

**Belgium.** There is still a good deal of talk about the great longshoremen's strike at Antwerp. Nothing could have shown more conclusively the superiority of the present organization of capital over that of labor. In 1900 there was organized at the Belgian capital the *Federation maritime*, a combine of vessel-owners backed by similar organizations at London, Liverpool, Hamburg and other foreign ports. Since the time of its organization the *Federation* has brought down the wages of its employees from ten to twenty cents a day, a very serious matter to men who at best can work only half time. Its most intolerable measure, however, was the creation of a "union" of its own, a union controlled absolutely by capitalists. The men were forced to leave their own organizations and enter this new one designed to keep them in their place.

The struggle began with a partial strike of the longshoremen, whose pay had been reduced from six francs to five. An attempt to force the men still at work to scab on their comrades resulted in a general strike. By the end of 1st August 15,000 men had walked out. The Mayor of Antwerp attempted to persuade the officers of the

*Federation* to arbitrate. The impatient reply of M. Stenman, the president, made it evident that his organization merely represented the international shipping interests, and that the fight was not against the old wage scale, but against Socialism. English and German ship-owners sent money and strike-breakers in plenty to support their brethren in distress. The struggle became bitter. Most readers of the *Review* will remember the great fires which terrorized Antwerp on Sept. 4th. and 5th. Public sentiment was with the strikers and they were valiantly supported by some of their comrades. But all they were finally able to secure was a compromise: their pay was cut down a half franc instead of a whole one. Tom Mann, an Australian union leader, published in October a scathing denunciation of English workers, "railway servants," sailors and others, who transported strike-breakers from England to Belgium. European journals have taken up the matter, and on all sides the conviction deepens that strikes cannot succeed so long as capitalists of all lands unite and workmen are content to help one another out now and then with a few dollars. Incidentally the "patriotism" of the employing class has been brought instructively into the lime-light.

**Russia.** The Russian government is feverishly taking advantage of the general despondency which has followed the unsuccessful outbursts of the past few years. Members of the first Douma who have thus far escaped persecution are now being brought to trial. All railway employees who took part in the strike of three years ago have been peremptorily discharged. It is reported on good authority that Finland is to be broken up and subjugated to a regime more despotic than the old one. Meantime the third Douma displays a great fondness for vacations; and when it is in session it is only with great difficulty that it can get a quorum. The members of the left take no part in its discussions.

**Portugal.** The disturbance which resulted on Feb. 1st. in the assassination of King Carlos hardly indicate a genuine revolutionary movement. To be sure there is a republican agitation on foot, but the real struggle is between different sorts of grafters who cannot agree as to the division of the spoils. The two parties in the Portuguese Parliament, the Progressists and the Regenerators, have for a long time carried on a system of rotation in office which admitted first one set of rogues and then the other to the public crib. The poor King, who had been left out of the reckoning, tried to assert himself by making Premier Franco dictator and refusing to call a session of Parliament. The latter measure, because of its unconstitutionality, gave the party leaders a chance to arouse popular revolt. The murder of the King was carefully planned by those same politicians. In all probability it will do more harm than good to the cause of republicanism in Portugal.

**Chile.** In December there occurred in Chile a barbarous massacre of striking nitrate-workers. In protest against the intolerable conditions under which they were forced to work in the deserts of the interior, these men, to the number of more than 15,000, had quit work and assembled in the seaport town of Iquique. The authorities ordered them to disperse; they refused, and the massacre followed. About 210 were killed and 50 wounded. The survivors were pursued to the mountains and hunted down like wild beasts. The Associated Press sent out reports of these events, but our newspapers saw fit to suppress them.



# LITERATURE AND ART

BY JOHN SPARGO

**Hinds' "American Communities".**—It is a fair test of the worth of a book that it should live thirty years, finding more readers at the end of the thirtieth year than ever before. And that is true of "American Communities", by William Alfred Hinds. Before me as I write there is a slim octavo volume of 175 pages, in a blue gray wrapper. It bears the title "American Communities", and the imprint of the almost wholly forgotten American Socialist, published at Oneida, N. Y. And the date is 1878.

In 1902, the first edition of the book having become a rarity, a second edition appeared, with the imprint of Charles H. Kerr & Company. It was essentially a new work, so complete had the author's revision been. Instead of one hundred and seventy pages, there were four hundred and thirty odd. The appearance of this revised version was most opportune in its coincidence with a revival of interest in the history of the Socialist movement in this country and the utopian communities and experiments, both religious and secular, which make the background for a study of that history. The works of John Humphrey Noyes and Charles Nordhoff had long gone out of print, and there was a real need for some adequate and sympathetic treatment of the subject. For such a task Mr. Hinds was peculiarly fitted, alike by experience and temperament, and his book at once took its place as a standard work, as the most comprehensive and authoritative book in its own peculiar field. The cardinal defects of the volume seemed to be, first: the inclusion of a number of trivial and unimportant experiments of no historical significance, and second: the failure to provide the student with adequate bibliographies of the really important experiments.

Now, at the beginning of 1908, thirty years after the first issue, Charles H. Kerr & Company issue the book in a still more expanded form, a bulky volume of six hundred pages. In one important respect the work has been greatly improved: there are bibliographical references to practically all the sketches of community experiments. There is also an index which adds to its value as a work of reference. The chief defect of the book in its present form arises from the author's lack of the historian's sense of perspective. He seems almost wholly devoid of a sense of values. One is astounded by the inclusion of accounts of such "communities" as Upton Sinclair's ill-fated, interesting Helicon Hall experiment in cooperative house-keeping and Elbert Hubbard's Roycroft establishment. If Roycroft, why not N. O. Nelson's Leclaire experiment and other examples of benevolent capitalistic paternalism? If one were to attempt to gather together all the examples of cooperation in this country similar to those described by Mr. Hinds, many volumes would be necessary.

For example, it is becoming quite the fashion in New York city now for wealthy people to cooperate for the purpose of erecting costly apartment buildings as residences for themselves—experiments quite as significant as some of those recorded by Mr. Hinds. Still, when all this is admitted, it yet remains to be added that the book as it stands is one of the indispensable standard works to the student.

American Socialists will not need to be warned that there can be no "establishment of Socialism" piecemeal. We have outgrown that form of utopianism. The aspiration toward Socialism now expresses itself through economic and political organization of the proletariat. It may well be that Mr. Hinds is right in believing that those engaged in these movements will more and more seek the advantages of community life. The book is well printed and there are numerous excellent illustrations.

\* \* \*

I hope, good reader, that you are not weary of utopian romance as yet, for there are a couple of books yet to be considered. They are not records of vain but glorious efforts to establish the perfect social state, but prophecies rather of how the perfect social state is to be ushered in. And—I whisper this to you gently!—they are not to be taken too seriously.

In **When Things Were Doing**, Comrade C. A. Steere has been gratifying a lurid and sometimes sardonic fancy. Indulging one of my bad habits, I turned to the last page of the book before starting to read it. There I caught sight of a confession by the hero of the story that it—whatever the "it" might be—was all due to a nightmare. So I began the story forewarned, and duly advised not to treat it too seriously. With a good deal of literary skill, Comrade Steere describes the *coup d'état* of the Social Revolution—as it occurred in a nightmare. And such a revolution! Imagine, if you can, a Socialist Board of Strategy, with a millionaire or two among its membership, sitting week after week preparing for the capture of the army and navy; dealing with inventions of such a nature as an explosive called *sizmos*, a five-gallon jar of which would split Manhattan Island in two; and submarine boats of miraculous powers. Then May Day is celebrated by the Socialist soldiers putting all others in jail and the declaration of the Socialist Republic!

There is a good deal of the Gilbert-and-Sullivan comic opera about this nightmare, and one feels all the time that the author is around the corner looking at one with a sardonic grin. He enjoys his joke the more in proportion as the reader insists upon taking him seriously. But one could wish that the author had taken himself a little more seriously, as a literary craftsman if not as a prophet. That he can write a good story is certain and his gift of humor is indisputable. But why, even in fooling us with a nightmare, should he mar his best passages with forced and unnatural slang when he didn't need that cheap subterfuge at all? I enjoyed his fooling, but not the manner of it!

\* \* \*

Our second forecast is by a man who takes himself seriously and demands to be taken seriously. And his imposing, important-looking volume of some three hundred and twenty admirably printed pages, illustrated by diagrams and maps, demands our most serious consideration. Comrade Charles W. Wooldridge, whose little book, **The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand**, has started many a pious brother on the road to Socialism, has been indulging his utopian fancy in a

book which he calls **Perfecting the Earth**. He starts with the Crisis of 1913. The date, if I am not mistaken, is the date fixed by Comrade Wilshire for the Social Revolution, but the crisis described bears a striking resemblance to the one we have been passing through lately. Like Comrade Steere, he begins the revolution with the U. S. Army, but in a very different spirit. For it is a peaceful revolution which is here described.

General Goodwill, finding himself in command of more than half a million men in a period of peace, proposes to Congress that he shall be permitted to use them in constructive work for the good of the nation. Not to divulge his secrets too soon, he asks to be permitted to keep his plans secret until they have been considered by a commission of world-famous scientists—and Congress—for the purpose of the story—forgets its class instincts and assents.

So we have the army of hate and murder transformed into an army of peace and industry. Reading the account of how this great army reclaimed waste places and made the desert blossom into sweetness, I have been reminded of the vision of my genial utopian friend, Capt. French, U. S. A., who believes in such a future for our military forces. Personally, I cannot pretend to a very keen interest in utopian forecasts of any kind, but I can readily see that such a book as **Perfecting the Earth** might solve some of the difficulties certain minds encounter in the study of Socialism. And it does show in a very rational manner, how an intelligent organization of labor would make plenty and comfort possible for all.

For the present, I have finished with the builders of Utopias and the history of past experiments in that same sphere of social enterprise.

\* \* \*

Some years ago, when I was editing the now defunct **Comrade**, I made arrangements for the publication of an American edition of a remarkable little booklet, a mere pamphlet in size—my friend George Plechanoff's little monograph, **Anarchism and Socialism**, which Eleanor Marx translated into English some thirteen years ago. It was our intention to reprint this translation with an introduction written especially for the edition by Plechanoff himself. The book was announced—but alas, it never got further than that! Now it has been issued by Charles H. Kerr & Company, as one of the excellent "Standard Socialist Series", in a form greatly superior to the English edition.

I confess that I doubt the wisdom of inserting "An American Introduction" from the pen of Comrade LaMonte between the quite sufficient preface by Eleanor Marx and the book itself. Comrade LaMonte has acquitted himself very well of a thankless and, to my mind, rather unnecessary task. Yet, an introduction which gave an account of Plechanoff's position in the International Movement, and of his work, in short, such a biographical sketch as Dr. Ingermann, for instance, could write, would have been a decided gain to the reader. For it is unfortunately true that George Plechanoff is an unknown quantity to most of our American comrades. Few know that he is perhaps the greatest living Marxist scholar—not even excluding Kautsky. I have always regarded it as unfortunate that, owing to the close associations existing between German and American Socialism, so little attention should have been given to the work of some of our Russian writers. Just at this moment, I do not recall a single book or pamphlet issued by our party press from the pen of any Russian Socialist writer, with the exception of this little work by Plechanoff—and that was translated from the German!



Suffice it to say that this little book is one of the most important in the literature of Socialism. It is probably not too much to claim for it that with the classic exception of the **Communist Manifesto**, no other book of its size is so important and worthy of careful study. The little book will do a great deal to make clear in the minds of our comrades the distinction between utopian and scientific methods, being even clearer than Engels' well known work upon that point. It will also do a great deal to destroy the very common notion that "Anarchism is a more advanced form of Socialism" to which many of our comrades cling.

**Socialist Artists.**—At a recent exhibition of Contemporary American Art, held in connection with the National Arts Club, New York, Socialist artists were well represented. In landscape there was the work of Leon Dabo, who has been compared to Whistler; he is a Socialist of long standing. Of the figure painters George B. Luke was beyond question the strongest man represented. Luke delights in the common types of our cities and he paints them—laborers, street waifs and starvelings—with terrible power. While Luke is not an avowed Socialist, his work is saturated with the spirit and feeling of Socialism and he is known to be most friendly toward the movement. George de Forest Brush, whose tender pictures of motherhood and childhood have endeared him to thousands of American households where prints of them are to be found, was not represented at the exhibition, but it is worthy of note that he, too, is an avowed Socialist. Quite the most notable things in the exhibition at the National Arts Club, however, were the fine pieces of sculpture by our comrade, Charles Haag. Two of his pieces, "The Universal Mother" and "The Immigrants" attracted more attention than anything else in the exhibition. Haag, who is a party member, is an old time Socialist, full of revolutionary enthusiasm. He has been connected with the movement for many years in Sweden, his native land; in Germany, Switzerland and France. His work unites something of the feeling of Millet, the peasant-painter and Meunier, the Belgian sculptor, with the revolutionary spirit of modern Socialism.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The action of the United States Supreme Court, briefly referred to in last month's Review, in smashing the employers' liability law, in killing the Erdman act and legalizing the blacklisting, and in outlawing the boycott by interpreting the Sherman anti-trust law to cover trade unions, has, as might be expected, aroused tremendous interest among the organized workers throughout the country. Of course, the Supreme Court is being denounced in bitter terms by the unionists, while the capitalistic organs and spokesmen chuckle merrily and declare with mock seriousness that "our courts will not uphold class legislation, such as is sought by the labor trust." President Van Cleave, of the National Association of Manufacturers, says piously that capital and labor ought be friends and dwell together in peace and harmony, and that the Supreme Court is bringing about this happy state of affairs. One of the big plute organs, the New York Commercial, says gleefully: "Only think of it—the great 'anti-trust' law, framed and enacted to mulct wicked Capital, now turned on honest Labor!"

The labor-haters did not hesitate long in following up the advantage that they gained in the decision of the Loewe Co. against the United Hatters. As was pointed out in the Review some time ago, the Loewe Co. sued the hatters for \$80,000 damages because of a boycott placed on that concern's scab products. Under the Sherman act the complainant may recover three-fold the damages sustained, plus cost of suit, attorneys fees, etc. The Loewe Co. claims a total of about \$300,000 and brought attachment proceedings against the defendants, tying up about \$180,000 of their property. Having received their cue from the Supreme Court, the union-smashers are becoming quite active. Daniel Davenport, a prominent member of the National Association of Manufacturers and counsel for Loewe & Co., announces that hundreds of concerns that are on the unfair list of the American Federation of Labor and affiliated organizations are preparing to take action against the unions to recover damages sustained on account of boycotts or institute criminal proceedings. Many unionists of New Orleans have been indicted as conspirators and violators of the Sherman anti-trust law, while in New York five officials of the Typographical Union have been fined various sums and sentenced to imprisonment. Actions are also contemplated in Philadelphia, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, Pittsburg and other places. The cases of the Maebeta-Evans glass combine against the Flint Glass Workers' Union, in which over a million dollars is involved, and the Bucks Stove & Range Co. against the A. F. of L. are still to be decided by the United States Supreme Court, but nobody is quite foolish enough

to believe that that court is likely to reverse itself, which would be an unheard of proceeding where labor interests are concerned.

The Sherman anti-trust law, under which the Loewe case was brought against the hatters, was enacted in 1887. It remained a dead letter until the Pullman strike in 1894, when Grover Cleveland utilized the law for the purpose of destroying the American Railway Union. Previously, in 1890, Congress had used the Sherman anti-trust law as a basis to pass an act "to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

In April, 1893, just one year before the Pullman strike, Judge Taft, now secretary of war, utilized the anti-trust law and the interstate commerce act as excuses to issue injunctions prohibiting the engineers on the Toledo & Ann Arbor railway from striking. The following year, 1894, Taft granted an injunction against the employees of the Cincinnati Southern railway to restrain them from compelling the road to boycott Pullman cars, and Organizer Phelan, of the A. R. U. was thrown in jail for contempt of court in advocating a strike and boycott. Thus Taft not only became the "father of injunctions," but likewise the pioneer in outlawing labor boycotts, as his acts were later sustained by the United States Supreme Court in the famous Debs case decision.

Section 1, of the act of 1890, declares that "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several states, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal." Provision is also made for a punishment of not less than one year or a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or both, for violation of this section.

It is in Section 4 that Taft and the injunction judges were given their power. That section invests Circuit Courts of the United States with jurisdiction to "prevent and restrain violations of this act." It also empowers courts to issue "temporary restraining orders (injunctions) as shall be deemed just in the premises."

Section 7 is the provision under which the Loewe Co. proceeded in claiming damages against the United Hatters of America, and there is no gainsaying the fact that the paragraph is plain enough. It says:

"Any person who shall be injured in his business or property by any other person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by this act, may sue therefor in any Circuit Court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover three-fold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fees."

There is still another important provision that permits the United States Supreme Court to override any state law, so that if any state declared unions exempt from anti-trust laws within its own boundary plaintiffs can appeal to the United States Supreme Court and secure judgments.

Those who have paid attention to the history of labor in the courts anticipated the Loewe verdict and were not at all surprised. Indeed, how could things be otherwise with capitalism in control of the governing functions? The tools of capital would betray their own class if they did not decide against labor in every crisis, and it is only those who persist in deluding themselves with the absurd notion that there is no class warfare who are surprised and chagrined. Probably if they continue to get their bumps regularly some day

their conceit will leave them long enough to permit new ideas to penetrate their stubborn and thick skulls. But it is to be deplored that the innocent are compelled to suffer with the guilty—that those who have pointed out the necessity for political action on the part of labor are constantly victimized, while egotistical chumps, who are never happier than when they can fawn about or crawl upon their bellies before the throne of capitalism, are lauded as “great leaders” and escape without much inconvenience to themselves.

How many times have the Socialists, when they stood in conventions and pointed out the trend of events and the natural developments in the class struggle, been ridiculed as “calamity howlers,” “prophets of evil,” and what not? In the Boston convention of the A. F. of L., for example, where the writer made a report showing how the British trade unionists were mulcted in the famous Taff Vale decision (a case exactly similar to the Loewe suit, which was brought the same year the Boston convention was held), and how the British unionists and Socialists were pulling together to put labor men in Parliament to protect their interests Gompers, instead of profiting by the experience of the workers across the sea, made a bitter attack upon the Socialists, and, to the delight of the capitalist bunch in the Civic Federation, tried to make it appear that the Socialists, although trade unionists almost wholly, were enemies of organized labor. “Economically,” Gompers declared, in his preroration, “you are unsound; socially, you are wrong; industrially, you are an impossibility.” The capitalist press and politicians from one end of the country to the other applauded Gompers’ speech “smashing socialism” and characterized its author as the greatest leader that stood on two feet. Well, the Socialists philosophically concluded to let the future decide whether they were unsound, wrong and impossible.

Now, after the short space of four years, we have Taff Valeism right here, and in a more malignant form than the British variety. Across the water capitalism merely attacked and confiscated union funds. Here capitalism not only aims to mulct the union treasuries, but the little bank savings and homes of workers who have practiced self-denial for years in order to save their wives and children from destitution and beggary are attacked. What can be said of such leadership that damns those who dare to sound a warning note and woos the workers into fancied security up to the point that they are dragged before the bar of capitalism, and stripped of their few belongings, lashed by the blacklist cat-o-nine-tails, and informed that they may be ground to pieces and their masters are not liable for damages to support their families! Could the black slaves of half a century ago be treated worse?

Let it be understood right here that the Socialists, although secure in the knowledge that their principles are based upon the rock of everlasting truth and that their methods will triumph, harbor no grudge against individuals or organizations of workers because of their shortsightedness. 'Tis human to err. In fact, we admire good fighters who consistently and as decently as possible battle for what they believe to be right. But there comes a time, in the natural order of progress, when either evolutionary facts or individual beliefs must give way, and usually it is the latter. Nor is it humiliating for any man who has fought a good fight to admit that he was in error and changes his methods. Wise men change their tactics; fools never do. Gompers and his friends have honestly and courageously, much as we question their judgment, fought along



industrial lines to gain what the Socialists seek to accomplish politically, and the former lost. Are Gompers and his friends big enough to acknowledge that the time has arrived for action, say along similar lines pursued by the British working people?

Looking at the situation from the most unbiased standpoint possible as a Socialist and member of a trade union, and with no ill will against Sam Gompers as a man (for I think well of the old scout despite some of his, what appear to me, unfair methods), I am firmly convinced that the hour has struck when calm and cool consideration of the present crisis is absolutely necessary. Let us sink our differences of the past, as we did, in fact, at the Norfolk convention, and get together in a national conference, as is the desire of the rank and file everywhere, and proceed along the lines of the British Socialists and trade unionists and include the farmers, if they will come, and organize a political combination that will strike terror to the hearts of the fossilized Supreme Court, the plutocratic Senate, the petty Czar Cannon and his House, and all the cheap-skate politicians throughout the land. Let the executive council of the A. F. of L. issue a call for a conference to affiliated organizations, representing, approximately, 2,000,000 members; to non-affiliated bodies, with 1,000,000 members; to the Farmers' Union, with 1,000,000 members; to the Socialist party, with practically 500,000 voters; to the Society of Equity, with 100,000 members, and other friendly organizations, and, even if only one-half send representatives, the little, insignificant crowd of plutocrats in control of affairs will sit up and take notice. It would not only not be necessary for any organization in an alliance of this kind to surrender its principles or organization, but there would be such mutual assistance and co-operation as would gain immediate attention and respect from the great unorganized mass to bring them into touch and close sympathy with the movement, and lead to better things in the future.

The organized workers as represented by the A. F. of L. not only demand political action, but if it is denied them they will either desert their organization or turn on their officers or so-called leaders. The old plan of pledging Congressional candidates is played out, as everybody knows that the politicians promise everything and fulfill nothing. To organize a separate Labor party of only A. F. of L. bodies would prove suicidal, as it would be sectional and appeal only to a branch of the labor class. Let us have a truly representative political movement, to include all the organizers, speakers, newspapers and other parts of the machinery that make for a great party.

## NEWS AND VIEWS

**Socialist Political Unity.** It would seem as though there ought not to be much hesitation in realizing the advantages to our movement in having all the Socialist forces marshalled under one political banner, and that if nothing else should bring us to our senses, the ridicule that is heaped upon us in the capitalist press ought to be sufficient. That is the way it strikes us in this office, and so we express ourselves both in our Finnish and in our English publications. We are very much confirmed in this position by reading the arguments against uniting with the S. L. P. that are to be met with in some quarters in our own party. They may be summarized as follows,—

That the S. L. P. have been in the past “a disturbing element”.

That they have thrown considerable mud at men who are prominent in our party.

That their voting strength has fallen off while ours has increased, thus proving, it is claimed, that, on questions of tactics, we have been in the right while they have been in the wrong.

We are much inclined to think that the S. L. P. have been a disturbing element; and that it is a good thing for our Party that they have been. We are inclined to think that the debt we owe them, for keeping our movement out of the bogs and quagmires of opportunism, is very great. That they have thrown considerable mud at men who are prominent in our Party is also probably true, but that fact can not be taken into consideration in the least when the best interests of the working-class require unity on the political field. The argument that the increase of our voting strength, as compared with theirs, justifies our tactics is the quintessence of Opportunism.

In fact it is worse. This is exactly the line of argument adopted by the workingman who votes the Republican or the Democratic ticket. He tells us that we have no chance to win, and that there is a chance of electing “good men”, and “friends of labor” on the capitalistic ticket. The same arguments exactly. The amendment to Lee’s motion, as proposed by National Committeeman King, ought to prevail, that is, to elect a special Committee to confer with the Committee elected by the S. L. P. to consider plans of Union, rather than to designate as our representatives the incoming Nat’l Ex. Committee, three of whom are personally objectionable to the S. L. P.

So let’s get together. Union is strength. One all-embracing Industrial Unionism is what we need, and one all-embracing Socialist Party and both revolutionary to the core.

**The Wage-Slave, Hancock, Mich.**

**A Proletarian Criticism.** In his article on “Woman and the Socialist Movement”, in the February Review, Spargo repeats the old

saying that "he who would be free must strike the first blow". He is right. Without doubt men are more interested in having the assistance of women in the movement in bringing about economic liberty to both sexes, than they are in woman gaining her own freedom from being the slave of slaves. When we have economic liberty for both sexes, woman will be in a position to demand and to take her entire liberty any time she so desires. But to-day she wants neither economic, political nor sex liberty. She has all the liberty she considers she is entitled to, or that she cares for. Working class men are just about the same. There are exceptions in both sexes, of course. The majority of working men imagined because they had secured political liberty they had all there was to be had. They are beginning to see they were mistaken, and some are beginning to find that their so-called political liberty, alone, can not even gain for them economic freedom. I suppose no socialist would deny to woman the right to vote. But why make a special effort to secure the ballot for her at present? Is there any reason to believe that the Supreme Court would have any more respect for the so-called labor laws which they have been declaring unconstitutional these many years, if women's votes had been instrumental in electing the law-makers?

It is indeed encouraging to see La Monte in his "Method of Propaganda," display so much brotherly love and appear so penitent. I suggest that he hunt up a priest and go to confession. His subject is a good one and he has some excellent suggestions; but his plea for laying-aside-of-differences won't wash down my throat. The different factions will unite when they have to, that is, when the force of economic development comes down on them with the force of the hydraulic press upon the paper that is being fashioned into car wheels. I believe nearly everybody will agree that all socialists are united on the main issues. We want the collective ownership of the tools of production and distribution and of all natural sources, and the democratic control of them. They say we differ on "tactics". If this is true, let us unite upon the things we are agreed upon. But right here is where all shades of reformers halt! They want a good thing but not too much of it at one time! We wage slaves can continue to endure our slavery for awhile, perhaps. We are used to it, so let the factions follow their own courses. I am confident that some day we shall unite upon the vital things, the things we are already agreed upon. So fellows, take your time.

L. B. Boudin's article on "Immigration at Stuttgart" was the very best thing in the February number.

**Peter F. Kennedy.**

**A Letter from Honolulu.** Recently we down here got together and formed a local of the National Party. Conditions here are not such that I anticipate startling results. On the one hand baronial estates employing asiatics whose wage, \$16.00 to \$20.00 per month is sufficient to support them, as they have been accustomed to be, four or five times over. In other words it costs an asiatic from four to six dollars per month to live, as he lived before coming here, and he receives from \$16.00 upward. So that he feels himself quite a man. He is extremely patriotic, to Japan, and sends his surplus quite regularly to his old home. On the other hand we have very few white mechanics or laborers and each year their number diminishes, while the native, the Hawaiian, is a man risen in the last 50 years from barbarism, and while amenable to reforms, innovatious and even revolution is still an unknown quantity. Some of our comrades, there are only 15 of us, lay great hopes in the Hawaiian. They know his discontent with existing conditions and think he can be railroaded into the Socialist movement and through it into the socialist state.

I believe that the proper political agitator could make a tremendous stampede by next election and would not be surprised if some Socialists could be elected, for the Hawaiian is credulous and if shown opportunity for betterment will follow a leader almost pell-mell. But, looking to the resultant, I think that success would be a calamity, almost, for the Hawaiian has not that stability that has come to the white race through a few generations of capitalism. I believe that political success here at present would be the inauguration of graft such as the country has not seen elsewhere.—Each week we come together, a motley crowd, a preacher, a doctor, an entomologist, a sculptor, a painter, myself and one or two working men and try to enrich our small stock of Socialist knowledge by original talks, readings and discussions. Enthusiastic? Oh, yes, as far as lies in our various occupations. We are mostly idealistically inclined and in the movement through that inclination and not through the bond created by belonging to the working class. Like all socialists, everywhere, the method of procedure is a bugbear with us. Some favor distributing literature, others political agitation on every occasion, others are for renting a good hall and going at it in a business way, others for not making too much noise until we amount to something (don't go into the water till you learn to swim). Nevertheless we feel a part of the big Socialist movement, make our little contributions to it, in one way and another, and have a hopeful outlook for the future.

H. CULMAN.

**Industrial Union Tactics.** While the position taken by Comrade Charles H. Kerr in regard to unity, in his article "Socialist Unity in the United States," in the December number, is correct, I find several matters in the article need correction. It is a fact that Socialist philosophy teaches that the only practical and successful way the working class can combat their capitalist oppressors is by uniting their forces on the lines of "the grievance of one is the grievance of all;" "Workers of the world unite! you have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain." These are the principles of Industrial Unionism, which are not a tangle of Utopian speculations that are perfectly futile, but have been proven and are practical and effective in this age of concentrated wealth and combinations of trusts, manufacturers' associations, citizens' alliances and employers' associations, as demonstrated by the Western Federation of Miners—An industrial union labor organization. The fact that many Socialists are active in bringing the message of Socialism into the labor unions, which embodies the principle of industrial unionism, proves conclusively that Socialists know it is necessary that unions become class conscious, and they will all in time adopt industrial unionism.

The Industrial Workers of the World does not make it compulsory for members to leave their union and join the I. W. W., but leaves this question to the option of the member, and, if his convictions lead him to join the I. W. W., nothing should prevent him from doing so. This position is taken by the Socialists as to former Republicans, Democrats and Prohibitionists joining the Socialist party. Many a Socialist has lost his job because he declared himself a Socialist. There was a certain element in the I. W. W. who had illegally used questionable tactics within our organization and abused those who did not believe as they did, but this element has been expelled. I. W. W. speakers are admitted to a large number of labor unions to explain the principles of Industrial Unionism: whole bodies of organized workers have joined the I. W. W. and it is actively engaged in organizing the unorganized workers.

Wm. J. F. Hannemann.



**A Neglected Adjunct to Socialism.** The perfect life aspired to by socialists must of necessity be rational, but few seem to realize the intimate correlation of socialism to the strife for the "Rational Life", the physiological revolution—physical culture. Neither movement can achieve its end without the other's aid. Our race is degenerate. To master the socialist philosophy takes clear brains, to win our battles, strong minds and physiques. Physical Culture produces a healthy mind in a healthy body. It is the only logical agent for the emancipation of woman and rescuing the sex relation from the prudish heterodoxies of "Civilization"; it promises a future perfect generation. Far from implying a return to savagery it teaches compliance with the laws of life. Its practice is free to all; environment may restrict its scope but cannot wholly annul its wholesome effects. Yet we parade our centuries old ignorance, asking hygienic measures from a ruling class while neglecting the opportunities for self-improvement within our reach. The attitude of part of our press, withholding such valuable information from the workers on the most flimsy pretexts, I consider criminal. The rulers are fast assimilating the doctrines of physical culture for their own benefit. In the hands of the workers physical culture will be a formidable weapon. Its use is a constant source of pleasure. Through it we shall attain to that high conception of life's possibilities which is the sharpest spur to social progress and that sublime self-reliance that knows no failure.

Charles Roux.

**A Note of Explanation.** On page 493 of the February Review we inserted a note to the effect that the article by Comrade Boudin was rejected by The Worker. We have received a letter from Comrade Lee, editor of The Worker, in which he explains that the article was omitted because he did not see the necessity of initiating a controversy between Comrade Boudin and Hillquit over the propriety of the various phrases of Hillquit's article; that he offered, however, ample space to Comrade Boudin for the discussion of the subject itself. We are glad in fairness to The Worker to print this explanation.

**A Word of Appreciation.** I want to tell you how much I like the February number of the Review. Comrade Spargo's article on Woman and the Socialist Movement is just what some of our locals need. Women are to be benefitted by the advent of socialism and we want and need their help in the work of propaganda. I. M. Robbins's article on The Economic Aspects of the Negro Problem should be in the hands of all our colored friends. They would soon learn to realize their present slavery and turn toward the ranks of the Socialist Party. Methods of Propaganda by LaMonte hit the nail on the head in regard to the workingman. He wants HIS. He is not interested in our little personal bickerings and if we use time so spent in showing him that his interests are with ours, we shall have worked to greater profit.

F. E. Welker, Cestos, Ola.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### HOW SOCIALIST BOOKS ARE PUBLISHED.

By John Spargo.

Nothing bears more remarkable evidence to the growth of the American Socialist movement than the phenomenal development of its literature. Even more eloquently than the Socialist vote, this literature tells of the onward sweep of Socialism in this country.

Only a few years ago, the entire literature of Socialism published in this country was less than the present monthly output. There was Bellamy's "Looking Backward," a belated expression of the Utopian school, not related to modern scientific Socialism, though it accomplished considerable good in its day; there were a couple of volumes by Professor R. T. Ely, obviously inspired by a desire to be fair, but missing the essential principles of Socialism; there were a couple of volumes by Laurence Gronlund and there was Sprague's "Socialism From Genesis to Revelation." These and a handful of pamphlets constituted America's contribution to Socialist literature.

Added to these, were a few books and pamphlets translated from the German, most of them written in a heavy ponderous style which the average American worker found exceedingly difficult. The great classics of Socialism were not available to any but those able to read some other language than English. "Socialism is a foreign movement," said the American complacently.

Even six or seven years ago, the publication of a Socialist pamphlet by an American writer was regarded as a very notable event in the movement and the writer was assured of a certain fame in consequence.

Now, in this year, 1908, it is very different. There are hundreds of excellent books and pamphlets available to the American worker and student of Socialism, dealing with every conceivable phase of the subject. Whereas ten years ago none of the great industrial countries of the world had a more meagre Socialist literature than America, to-day America leads the world in its output.

Only a few of the many Socialist books have been issued by ordinary capitalist publishing houses. Half a dozen volumes by such writers as Ghent, Hillquit, Hunter, Spargo and Sinclair exhaust the list. It could not be expected that ordinary publishers would issue books and pamphlets purposely written for propaganda on the one hand, nor the more serious works which are expensive to produce and slow to sell upon the other hand.

The Socialists themselves have published all the rest—the propaganda books and pamphlets, the translations of great Socialist classics and the important contributions to the literature of Socialist



philosophy and economics made by American students, many of whom are the products of the Socialist movement itself.

They have done these great things through a co-operative publishing house, known as Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative). Nearly 2000 Socialists and sympathizers with Socialism, scattered throughout the country, have joined in the work. As shareholders, they have paid ten dollars for each share of stock in the enterprise, with no thought of ever getting any profits, their only advantage being the ability to buy the books issued by the concern at a great reduction.

Here is the method: A person buys a share of stock at ten dollars (arrangements can be made to pay this by installments, if desired) and he or she can then buy books and pamphlets at a reduction of fifty per cent.—or forty per cent. if sent post or express paid.

Looking over the list of the company's publications, one notes names that are famous in this and other countries. Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Lassalle, and Liebknecht among the great Germans; Lafargue, Deville and Guesde, of France; Ferri and Labriola, of Italy; Hyndman and Blatchford, of England; Plechanoff, of Russia; Upton Sinclair, Jack London, John Spargo, A. M. Simons, Ernest Untermyer and Morris Hillquit, of the United States. These, and scores of other names less known to the general public.

It is not necessary to give here a complete list of the company's publications. Such a list would take up too much room—and before it was published it would become incomplete. The reader who is interested had better send a request for a complete list, which will at once be forwarded, without cost. We can only take a few books, almost at random, to illustrate the great variety of the publications of the firm.

You have heard about Karl Marx, the greatest of modern Socialists, and naturally you would like to know something about him. Well, at fifty cents there is a charming little book of biographical memoirs by his friend Liebknecht, well worth reading again and again for its literary charm not less than for the loveable character it portrays so tenderly. Here, also, is the complete list of the works of Marx yet translated into the English language. There is the famous **Communist Manifesto** by Marx and Engels, at ten cents, and the other works of Marx up to and including his great master-work, **Capital**, in three volumes at two dollars each—two of which are already published, the other being in course of preparation.

For propaganda purposes, in addition to a big list of cheap pamphlets, many of them small enough to enclose in a letter to a friend, there are a number of cheap books. These have been specially written for beginners, most of them for workmen. Here, for example, one picks out at a random shot Work's "What's So and What Isn't," a breezy little book in which all the common questions about Socialism are answered in simple language. Or here again we pick up Spargo's "The Socialists, Who They Are and What They Stand For," a little book which has attained considerable popularity as an easy statement of the essence of modern socialism. For readers of a little more advanced type there is "Collectiveism," by Emil Vandervelde, the eminent Belgian Socialist leader, a wonderful book. This and Engel's "Socialism Utopian and Scientific" will lead to books of a more advanced character, some of which we must mention. The four books mentioned in this paragraph cost fifty cents each, postpaid. They are well printed and neatly and durably bound in cloth.

Going a little further, there are two admirable volumes by Antonio Labriola, expositions of the fundamental doctrine of Socialist philosophy, called the Materialist Conception of History, and a

volume by Austin Lewis, "The Rise of the American Proletarian," in which the theory is applied to a phase of American history. These books sell at a dollar each, and it would be very hard to find anything like the same value in any other publisher's catalogue. Only the co-operation of nearly 2000 Socialist men and women make it possible.

For the reader, who has got so far, yet finds it impossible to understand a study of the voluminous work of Marx, either for lack of leisure or, as often happens, lack of the necessary mental training and equipment, these are two splendid books, notable examples of the work which American Socialist writers are now putting out. While they will never entirely take the place of the great work of Marx, nevertheless, whoever has read them with care will have a comprehensive grasp of Marxism. They are: L. B. Boudin's "The Theoretical System of Karl Marx" and Ernest Untermann's "Marxian Economics." These also are published at a dollar a volume.

Perhaps you know some man who declares that "There are no classes in America," who loudly boasts that we have no class struggles: just get a copy of A. M. Simons' "Class Struggles in America," with its startling array of historical references. It will convince him if it is possible to get an idea into his head. Or you want to get a good book to lend to your farmer friends who want to know how Socialism touches them: get another volume by Simons called "The American Farmer." You will never regret it. Or perhaps you are troubled about the charge that Socialism and Anarchism are related. If so, get Plechanoff's "Anarchism and Socialism" and read it carefully. These three books are published at fifty cents each.

Are you interested in science? Do you want to know the reason why Socialists speak of Marx as doing for Sociology what Darwin did for biology? If so, you will want to read "Evolution, Social and Organic," by Arthur Morrow Lewis, price fifty cents. And you will be delighted beyond your powers of expression with the several volumes of the Library of Science for the Workers, published at the same price. "The Evolution of Man" and "The Triumph of Life," both by the famous German scientist, Dr. Wilhelm Boelsche; "The Making of the World" and "The Ending of the World," both by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer; and "Germs of Mind in Plants," by R. H. France, are some of the volumes which the present writer read with absorbing interest himself and then read them to a lot of boys and girls, to their equal delight.

One could go on and on talking about this wonderful list of books which marks the tremendous intellectual strength of the American Socialist movement. Here is the real explosive, a weapon far more powerful than dynamite bombs! Socialists must win in a battle of brains—and here is ammunition for them.

Individual Socialists who can afford it should take shares of stock in the great enterprise. If they can pay the ten dollars all at once, well and good; if not, they can pay in monthly instalments. And every Socialist local ought to own a share of stock in the company, if for no other reason than that literature can then be bought much more cheaply than otherwise. But of course there is an even greater reason than that—every Socialist local ought to take pride in the development of the enterprise which has done so much to develop a great American Socialist literature.

Fuller particulars will be sent upon application. Address:

**CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY (Co-operative),**  
**264 East Kinzie Street, Chicago, Ill.**